

A  
Scholaſtical History  
OF  
Lay-Baptiſm.

---

PART II.

---

WITH  
Some Conſiderations on Dr. *Brett's* and  
Mr. *L-----*'s Answers to the Firſt  
Part.

---

By JOSEPH BINGHAM,  
Rector of *Havant*.

---

L O N D O N:

Printed by *W. D.* for R. KNAPLOCK at the  
*Bishop's-Head* in St. Paul's Church-Yard.

M DCC XIV.



THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

OF

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY



---

---

TO THE  
RIGHT HONOURABLE  
AND  
RIGHT REVEREND  
Father in GOD,  
JONATHAN,  
Lord Bishop of *Winchester*,  
AND  
Prelate of the most Noble Order  
of the GARTER.

MY LORD,

I CANNOT but take this Opportunity  
to make my Publick Acknowledgments  
for the late Favour your Lordship has  
been pleas'd to bestow upon me, as an  
Encouragement to proceed in my Laborious  
Work



## *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

Work of Reducing the Antiquities of the Church into one Body or View. It is no small Satisfaction to me that I have hitherto proceeded with your Lordship's Approbation, not excepting my last Dissertation upon the Judgment and Practice of the Church in reference to the Baptism of Laymen, with which some (who can bear no Contradiction) have been pleased, without Reason, to be offended; to whom, I hope, I have given abundant Satisfaction in the present Discourse. I did not, I confess, write the former Part of this *Scholastical History* by your Lordship's particular Direction or Command (tho' some have done me so great an Honour as to say so; and I shall ever be proud of doing any thing that is good by the Direction and Command of my Superiors;) your Lordship did not so much as know what Subject I was upon, till it was finished; nor did I perfectly know your Lordship's Sentiments upon the Point, till You were pleas'd to honour me with a Letter of Thanks for my Book, and tell me that You exceedingly approved of it; and particularly that Part of it which treats of the Deficiency of *Heretical* and *Schismatical Baptisms*, and of the Obligation those, who are so Baptized, lie under to return to the Unity of the Church, in order to have the Defects of their Baptism supplied by Imposi-  
tion



---

## *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

---

tion of Hands in Confirmation ; which was the usual way of supplying such Defects, according to the General Rule and Practice of the Ancient Church. Your Lordship was pleased also to acquaint me (with what I did not understand before) that all the Bishops of both Provinces were unanimously of the same Opinion which I had defended, and thought there were other ways of supplying a faulty Baptism, than by Rebaptization, if given in due Form by a Layman. And tho' your Lordship did not consent to subscribe the Resolution which was then intended to be drawn up, yet it was not because you dissented from them in the main of the Determination, but because you thought it more proper to have added the Words, *In Cases of Necessity*, which are Cases less liable to Exception, whose Deficiency, whatever it be, may most certainly be rectified by Confirmation. And so far both the Rules and Practice of the Church of *England*, for these last Two-Hundred Years are clear : For we have neither Order nor Example to encourage Rebaptization in any such Case, no not after the Rubrick had confined the Ministration of Baptism wholly to the Hands of a Lawful Minister. For still no Rule was made, that such as were not Baptized by a Lawful Minister should be Rebaptized ; but they were required to receive the Bishop's Confirmation,

\* 3



---

## *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

---

firmation, and then were admitted to the Eucharist, and the Privilege of Christian Burial, neither of which are allowed to Unbaptized Persons. Notwithstanding all this, I am charged by some, as a False and Self-interested Writer; as one that is writing against the true Church of *England*; as an Encourager of Dissenters; because I would not suffer certain Persons to represent the Church just as they pleased, and fix upon her such Principles and Practices as are peculiar to the Dissenters only; because I would not join with them in advancing *Cartwright's* Notions about Rebaptization, against the Church of *England*, and revile and undervalue all the eminent Bishops and Doctors of the Church that have wrote heretofore in her Defence, and Learnedly defended her Constitution; because I would not withdraw the Writers of the Primitive Church, and represent them as favourable to this Novel Hypothesis, when without the greatest Injustice to Them, and the World, and Myself, I could not do it; because I would not allow all the Hereticks and Schismatics of the Primitive Church, to be as true Priests of GOD, and invested with as ample Commission, Power, and Authority to Baptize, when they were actually Degraded, and removed from all Sacerdotal Offices by the Discipline of the Church, as those Catholick Priests who never  
were



---

## *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

---

were under any such Censure. And yet upon this last Point (upon which the whole Controversy turns, and the whole Discipline of the Church depends) the Adversaries are strangely divided. One of them thinks, Heretical and Schismatical Priests are safe under the Protection of *Indelible Character*; that is, they can never be wholly divested of their Sacerdotal Commission, let the Church use what Authority she can or will to take it from them; their Indelible Character will still preserve their Sacerdotal Authority entire to them, and no Power on Earth can extend so far as to deprive them of the Internal Power of Priests, whatever restraint she may lay upon the external Exercise of their Function. The other Champion of the Cause will not venture to go thus far, so to destroy all Ecclesiastical Discipline at a Blow, and cut the very Sinews of Episcopal Power in pieces. Which he is sensible must be the Consequence, if they who grant the Sacerdotal Authority to Priests, have not Power, acting by the Canons, to withdraw the same Commission again, in case of Heresy, or Schism, or any the like Occasion. For then there is an end of all Authority and Power in the Church; and the Ecclesiastical Censures, when inflicted upon a Delinquent Bishop, or Priest, to deprive them of Sacerdotal Authority and Power, is but a Bugbear.



---

## *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

---

Here therefore he deserts his Fellow-Disputant, and owns there is a Real and Effectual Power in the Church to withdraw the Sacerdotal Commission from Heretical and Schismatical Bishops and Priests, and deprive them of their Authority, and reduce them to the state of Laymen: In which Case, he confesses, their Baptisms are as much Unauthorized and Uncommissioned as those of any other Laymen. But then he pretends, that no Church, except the *Cyprianick* Churches, ever exercised this Power against Hereticks and Schismaticks: Tho' their Commissions were Delible, and the Church had Power to delete them, yet no Church, beside the *Cyprianick*, ever actually deleted them. So that, according to him, Hereticks and Schismaticks were still acknowledged by the Church to be Lawful Priests, in actual and full Commission, and the Church was so kind to them, even during their Heresy and Schism, as to leave them in full Possession of their Sacerdotal Authority, and never withdraw her Commission from them. Which is such a Representation of the Primitive Church, and so grand a Reflection on her Discipline, as I believe no one ever made before him. But it was necessary to save this Gentleman's Hypothesis, who otherwise must have been forced to own, that the Primitive Church did  
gene-



---

## *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

---

generally receive the Baptisms of Hereticks and Schismatics (when given in due Form) at the same time that she accounted them to be no Priests, but actually deprived of their Commission, and reduced to the state of Laymen. For he is very sensible, and any one with half an Eye may see it, That if the ancient Church did actually by her Discipline deprive Hereticks and Schismatics of their Commission, and thereby divest them of all Sacerdotal Authority and Power; then they were no longer Priests in that State, but reduced, by vacating their Commission, to the Degree and Condition of Laymen: And if the Church, notwithstanding this, received the Baptisms of such Hereticks and Schismatics without Rebaptizing, then she must receive the Baptisms of such Persons as had then no Sacerdotal Commission, being such as she herself had deprived of Commission, and reduced to the state of Laymen. The Consequence is here so plain, that our Author, on supposition the Premises stand good, cannot pretend to deny it. All the Dispute now therefore is reduced to this one Point, Whether the ancient Hereticks and Schismatics, whose Baptisms the Primitive Church received and compleated by Confirmation, without a second Baptism, were true Authorized Priests in Actual Commission, during their Heresy or Schism; or only Nominal Priests,



---

## *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

---

Priests, whose Commission was vacated by the same Lawful Episcopal Power and Authority which first committed it to them? Our Author does not dispute the Power of the Church to vacate the Commission of Heretical or Schismatical Priests, but boldly affirms, That no Churches, except the *Cyprianick*, ever actually exercised this Discipline upon them, but left them still in full Commission, and lawful Possession of the Power and Authority of the Priesthood. Which I have proved to be a Grand Mistake, and a Grand Reflection upon the Discipline of the whole Catholick Church, and such an Abetting of Hereticks and Schismatics, as sets them upon the same Level with Catholick Priests, which the Catholick Church never intended. For she always vacated the Commission of Heretical and Schismatical Priests, and by her just Power and Discipline took away all Sacerdotal Authority from them, leaving them in the state of Unauthorized and Uncommissioned Laymen. This I have proved from such undeniable Evidence, from the ancient Rules and Canons of General and Particular Councils, and the Practice and Proceedings of the whole Catholick Church, that the contrary Assertion must be the effect either of very great Ignorance, or very great Prejudice, and a Resolution to serve an Hypothesis, in any one



---

## *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

---

one that will venture to maintain it. The Result then of the whole Enquiry is this, That the Catholick Church was so far from Abetting or Encouraging the Priesthood of Hereticks and Schismaticks, that she Vacated and Destroyed their Commission, and reduced them, by her Discipline, to a state of Laymen: But yet she did not wholly Cancel and Disannul the Unauthorized Baptisms of those Uncommissioned Laymen, or Priests who had lost their Commission; she did not order all Men to be Rebaptized, who were Baptized by them; but only supplied what was Irregular, Unauthorized, and Deficient, by her own Just Authority and Power in a subsequent Confirmation. And it is well known, that the Practice of the Church of *England*, for these 200 Years has been the very same; and few, besides Profest Dissenters from her, have offered to oppose it. Yet they who now oppose her Practice, and maintain the Principle of Dissenters, will needs outface the World, and bear all Men down, that they are the only true Defenders of the Church, who really desert her Cause, and reflect upon her Practice; and that they who defend her Practice, and shew it to be agreeable to the Practice of the whole Catholick Church, are Men of ill Designs; That they who will not allow the Priesthood of Hereticks and Schismaticks to

to



---

## *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

---

to be as good as that of true Catholicks, are Enemies to CHRIST and the Christian Priesthood ; And that they who write in Defence of the Churches Discipline, both Ancient and Modern, are Subverters of her Constitution. I have lately received a Letter from an Unknown Hand, which I shall beg leave to insert in this place.

S I R,

**Y**OU will perhaps wonder to receive this from one that never saw you, and perhaps never may. But it is out of Kindness to you, to let you know what (Opinion) the true Church of England-Men have of you about us: Your Origines, &c. gained you a great Reputation, and notwithstanding some Mistakes, incident to all Mankind, you were looked upon as a Member of the Church both Willing and Able to serve her. The News of your Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism being published, caused great Joy to several about me, hoping so able a Pen as yours would have set that Matter in a clear Light, and have ended a Dispute, which has caused so much Trouble to the Church, Triumph to its Adversaries, and a staggering in several well-meaning Men; but to our great Surprise, it proved only a Daubing, Prevaricating Piece, to recommend yourself to the Moderate Party, falsely so called, and their Patrons, Unfortunately crept in to  
some



---

# *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

---

*some of the Highest Places in the Church. The World has long waited for your Justification, in Answer to Mr. Lawrence, which if you refuse to do, all Mankind will impute it to your Guilt, and that you own yourself a False and Self-interested Writer; which I do assure you is the Opinion of*

Your Servant

London, Sept. 22.

*True Darbyshire.*

All I shall say in Answer to this, is only, *Blessed are ye when Men shall Revile you, and Persecute you, and shall say all manner of Evil against you falsely for my sake: Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in Heaven.* What Reward I am to expect on Earth for my Service, I know not. What your Lordship bestowed upon me, was for my former Labours, and not for this. For You were pleased to give me the Offer of it before ever my last Book appeared in Print, and before You Yourself was acquainted with the Purport of it. And I hope this Gentleman (whoever he is) or his Friends, will not be angry at your Lordship for giving a little Encouragement to the Author of the *Origines Ecclesiasticae*, which gained him, he says, a great Reputation, and made him to be looked upon as a Member of the Church both willing and able to serve her. That may be  
suffi-



---

## *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

---

sufficient to justify your Lordship in bestowing your Favour upon a Person of such a Character. But I have now spoiled all by writing a *Daubing, Prevaricating Piece*, to recommend myself to the Moderate-Party (falsly so called) and their Patrons, unfortunately crept into some of the highest Places in the Church. Some Persons take a great Latitude in distinguishing Men and Parties, and fixing Names to them as they please; for which, perhaps, they may be accountable another Day. I suppose now, every one that declares against Rebaptization, is by this Gentleman reckoned among his Moderate-Party-Men: And then I see not how your Lordship, or the Archbishop of *York*, or the Bishop of *Bath and Wells*, will escape the Imputation of being Patrons of the Moderate Party (and that, in this Gentleman's Opinion, unfortunately crept into some of the highest Places in the Church) because You have, with many others, declared yourselves freely against Rebaptization, as contrary to the Sense and Practice of the Catholic Church and the Church of *England*. But perhaps he had his Eye more upon some others, when he spake of *Moderate-Party-Men and their Patrons*: And if so, I can assure him, the Author of the *Origines* had no occasion to write a *Daubing, Prevaricating Piece* to recommend himself to them; having

ving



---

## *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

---

ving gained himself, by his former Labours, a good Esteem with them, as well as others; as writing what was of General Use, and to General Satisfaction. But my Crime is, that I wrote against one whom he calls Mr. *Lawrence*, (for I myself must not, without a Rebuke, presume to call him so;) one who, in the Opinion of this Gentleman, and his Friends, is highly to be regarded: And unless I justify myself against him, all Mankind will impute it to my Guilt, and that I own myself a False and Self-interested Writer. But perhaps he may be a little out in his Computation. For if I had never answered his Book, all Men would not have judged so hardly: There are many who think it needs no Answer; and others, who would have imputed not Answering to other Causes; to Indisposition, or want of Time, and Avocation by other Studies and Labours, or a Willingness not to insist too long upon such a Debate, when I had a far greater Work still upon my hand. But to prevent all farther Demands, the World has now my Justification, whereby it will appear who is the most Faithful Representer of the Sense and Practice of the Catholick Church; which I have, in this Second Part of the *Scholastical History*, delivered with such Plain, Full, and Authentick Evidence, as cannot fail of giving Satisfaction to all such as will read  
with-



---

## *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

---

without Prejudice, and with a Design to inform themselves of the true Discipline and Practice of the Ancient Church, in reference to the Baptisms administred by Declared Hereticks and Schismaticks, whom she accounted no more than Laymen. If any Men for doing this will call me again a False and Self-interested Writer, they may use their Pleasure: Such Reproaches will only teach me, that there are some Men in the World, who are not to be obliged by any Useful Services, unless a Man will give up his Understanding to them, and write History against the Church, in Favour of their Particular Conceptions and Opinions. Which I have never yet done, and, by the Grace of GOD, never intend to do, tho' speaking Truth expose me to a Thousand worse Reproaches. I cannot yet see any Reason to espouse the Principle of Dissenters about Rebaptization against the Church; I have more Honour for the Priesthood, than to put it into the Hands of Declared Hereticks and Schismaticks, against the Discipline and Practice of the first Six General Councils of the Church; which some, who call themselves the only true Churchmen, are forced to do, because their Hypothesis obliges them to do it, lest they should be forced to confess the Baptism of such Hereticks and Schismaticks to be no more than the Baptism of Laymen. Which  
if



---

## *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

---

if they once own, they know they must give up the Argument drawn from the Practice of the Catholick Church, which received the Baptisms of Hereticks and Schismaticks without Rebaptizing, whilst she accounted the Administrators to be no more than Laymen. These things are so plainly Demonstrated in the following Discourse, that tho' I despair of Convincing some Men, yet I doubt not it will open the Eyes of many, and give them Rational Satisfaction, as to what concerns the Discipline of the Primitive Catholick Church, whose Example in this Point of Discipline is now followed by the Church of *England*: Both which conjoined together, I have endeavoured to Vindicate from the Misrepresentations of those, who, under colour of Defending, manifestly oppose them both. I know indeed, it is confidently pretended by the Adverse Party, that they are writing in Defence of the Church, against the Dissenters: But Wise and Considering Men take this to be a very odd way of Defending the Church, To espouse the Profest Principle of Dissenters about Rebaptizing, and maintain it against the Churches Practice, and yet, after all, call this, *Defending the Church against the Dissenters*. They say indeed, they are persuading the Dissenters

†

to



---

## *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

---

to come into the Church, and be Rebaptized, because Lay-Baptism is Invalid : But this is only proving to them what they do not deny ; For they assert the same thing, That Lay-Baptism is Invalid, whilst the Church denies this by her constant Practice. Therefore instead of writing Dissertations about the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, which they do not deny, they should convince Dissenters, that their Ministers are only Laymen ; And then they would readily hearken to the Doctrine of Rebaptization, because this Doctrine is according to their own Principles : But as the Matter stands at present, writing for the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, in the way that they do, is only writing against the Church, without any Effect at all upon Dissenters ; who are convinced of nothing more thereby, than what they profess to believe before, That Lay-Baptism is Invalid, which they always asserted and maintained against the Church, from the Beginning of the Reformation. They pretend farther, to be maintaining the Cause of the Primitive Church, and the Christian Priesthood, against Hereticks and Schismatics, and other Usurpers : When yet it is plain, they manifestly lodge the Power of the Priesthood in the hands of Hereticks and Schismatics, which the

Anci-



---

## *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

---

Ancient Church took from them; And they thereby Misrepresent the Discipline of the Church, as Favouring the Priesthood of Hereticks, which she utterly denied. So they give a secret Wound to the Christian Priesthood, and cast a Blemish on the Ancient Discipline, even whilst they would appear to their Admirers to be the only zealous and true Defenders of them. If these things be undeniably proved in the following Discourse, then I hope it will a little abate the Confidence of these Gentlemen, and work them either into Satisfaction or Silence, when they find themselves so palpably mistaken about the Priesthood of Hereticks, and the Discipline of the Ancient Church in relation to such a pretended Priesthood. As I know no better way to end the present Dispute about Lay-Baptism, so I hope it will not be Unacceptable to your Lordship or the World, to see the Proceedings of the Ancient Councils against Hereticks and Schismatics, brought into one View, in order to illustrate this Part of Ancient History, and set it in a just Light, pursuant to my General Design of Collecting and Illustrating the Antiquities of the Christian Church; in which I have hitherto proceeded with your Lord-

† 2 ship's



# *The Epistle Dedicatory.*

ship's Countenance and Approbation, and  
hope to finish it under your Encouragement  
and Protection, who am,

*My LORD,*

*Your most Obliged,*

*most Dutiful, and*

*Obedient Servant,*

*Joseph Bingham.*

**T H E**





# THE CONTENTS.

**T**HE State of the present Controversy.

- §. 1. *No farther Dispute with Dr. Brett, about the Modern Greek Church.* §. 2. *Nor about the Churches of the Reformation.* §. 3. *How far we are agreed about the Church of England.* §. 4. *How far we are agreed about the Primitive Writers.* §. 5. *Whether St. Basil's Canon, and the Council of Trullo determine the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism in the Practice of the Church.* §. 6. *An Account of the Luciferian Heresy. And whether St. Jerom be a witness of the Churches Annulling the Baptism of Laymen in Ordinary Cases.* §. 7. *The Testimony of St. Chrysostom no Evidence against the Baptism of Laymen in extraordinary Cases.*



---

## The C O N T E N T S.

---

### C H A P. I.

**T**Hat Hereticks and Schismaticks and Degraded Clerks, and Excommunicated Clerks, when once they are Convicted and Legally Censured, are no longer Authorized to minister Baptism, or officiate as true Priests and Ministers of G O D and the Church ; but that thenceforth all their Acts are Unauthorized, and done only by Usurpation. This proved from the History of the first Six General Councils, and their Proceedings against Hereticks and Schismaticks and other Delinquents.

§. 1 *How Meletius was deposed and Divested of all Ministerial Authority by the Council of Nice.* §. 2. *How Arius was Deposed and Anathematized by the same Council.* §. 3. *How the Macedonians, Apollinarians, and other Hereticks, were Degraded and Anathematized in the Second Council of Constantinople.* §. 4. *How the Third General Council of Ephesus Degraded Nestorius and his Followers.* §. 5. *How the Council of Chalcedon Deposed Euty-*

CHAP. I.



---

## The CONTENTS.

---

Eutyches and Dioscorus, and their Adherents. §. 6. Of the Condemnation of Anthimus and Severus in the Council of Constantinople under Mennas. An. 536. §. 7. How the Defenders of the Tria Capitula were degraded in the fifth General Council of Constantinople. §. 8. How the sixth General Council of Constantinople Deposed and Anathematized the Monothelites. §. 9. How the Council of Trullo censured Delinquent Bishops and Clerks.

---

### CHAP. II.

**T**HE same Assertion proved from Patriarchal, National, and Provincial Councils; and from the Writings of Private Fathers; with several Arguments drawn from their Testimony: The first Argument, That some Hereticks; whose Baptism was received, never had originally any Real and True Ordination to the Ministerial Office and Function: Consequently they could be no other than



---

## THE CONTENTS.

---

Unauthorized Persons. This particularly proved upon the *Novatian* Hereticks.

§. 1. *A short Reference to such Patriarchal, National, and Provincial Councils, as agree with the forementioned General Councils.*

§. 2. *The first Argument founded upon the Novatians wanting a true Ordination.*

§. 3. *That Novatian was never a true Bishop. This proved, first, because he had only a Simoniacal and forced Ordination.*

§. 4. *Proved farther, because he intruded himself into a full See.*

---

## CHAP. III.

**A**RGUMENT 2. That Hereticks are not Authorized Ministers of GOD, because when they fall into open and profest Heresy, they cease to be true Christian Priests, and become Wolves and Antichrists, instead of true Shepherds and Governours of the Flock of CHRIST.

§. 1. *That a Lawful Ordination does not secure a Man in the Possession of a Perpetual Authorized Priesthood, unless he observe*  
the



---

## The CONTENTS.

---

*the Rules of the Priesthood. §. 2 This proved from Cyprian, who declares Hereticks to forfeit both the Name and Authority of Priests. §. 3. And from the Council of Aquileia under St. Ambrose. §. 4. And from the Council of Colonia Agrippina. §. 5. From an Italick Council under St. Ambrose, An. 381. §. 6. From the Roman Council under Damasus, An. 369. §. 7. From the Testimony of Domnus Bishop of Antioch, and John Cassian. §. 8. From the Decrees of Pope Innocent. §. 9. And Pope Simplicius. §. 10. And Pope Vigilius.*

---

### C H A P. IV.

**A**Rgument 3. That Hereticks and Degraded Clerks were not Authorized Priests, in the Account of the Ancient Church, because, by her Discipline they were reduced to the State and Communion of Laymen.

§. 1. No Persons who were obliged to do Publick Penance, allowed to be of the Clergy.  
§. 2. All Degraded Persons reduced, at least, to Lay-Communion. §. 3. This proved from Cyprian, and his Contemporaries,  
A 4 Cornelius,



---

## The CONTENTS.

---

*Cornelius, and the Council of Carthage.*

*§. 4. And from the Apostolical Canons.*

*§. 5. And the Council of Eliberis. §. 6.*

*And the Council of Sardica. §. 7. And*

*the Council of Agde. §. 8. The Council*

*of Orleans. §. 9. The first Council of*

*Toledo. §. 10. The Council of Hippo,*

*and St. Austin. §. 11. The Decrees of*

*Pope Innocent. §. 12. And Siricius, and*

*St. Jerom. §. 13. And St. Basil. §. 14.*

*And the Council of Trullo.*

---

## CHAP. V.

**A**Rgument 4. That Hereticks and Schismaticks and Degraded Clerks were not accounted Authorized Priests, because they were sometimes thrust down one Degree below Laymen, by being Anathematized and cast out of the Communion of the Church.

*§. 1. That no Man is reckoned a compleat Lay-man but he that is in full Communion with the Church. §. 2. Hereticks and*

*Schismaticks and Degraded Clerks sometimes denied the Privilege of Lay-Communion. §. 3. This proved from the Testi-*

*mony of Cyprian. §. 4. And the Aposto-*  
*lical*



---

## The CONTENTS.

---

*lical Canons. §. 5. And the Council of Colen. §. 6. And the Council of Sardica. §. 7. And the Council of Eliberis. §. 8. And the Council of Rome under Felix III. An. 487.*

---

### CHAP. VI.

**T**HE Objection taken from the Notion of an Indelible Character imprinted in the Ordination of a Priest, examined, and shewed to be of no Force against the former Allegations. With an Account of the first Original and Meaning of that Term in the Writings of the Church.

*§. 1. What meant by an Indelible Character imprinted in Baptism. §. 2. That the Indelible Character of Ordination is of the same Nature. §. 3. The Name of Indelible Character not to be found in any ancient Council. §. 4. In what Sense St. Austin owns and allows it in Heretical Priests. §. 5. What the Papists mean by their Indelible Character. §. 6. How far an Indelible Character is allowed by Protestant Writers. §. 7. What Submission is due to*



---

## The CONTENTS.

---

*to the Judgment of the Catholick Church, in  
such Points of Discipline as Rebaptizing  
and Reordaining.*

---

### CHAP. VII.

**A** Resolution of some Difficulties  
concerning the Communion of  
Hereticks, and their Baptisms, and  
Ordinations.

§. 1. *Whether it be lawful to hold Communion  
with Heretical Priests before they be De-  
graded.* §. 2. *Whether it be Lawful to  
Communicate with Hereticks, when a whole  
Church is Heretical.* §. 3. *Whether, in  
any Case, it be Lawful to desire the Bap-  
tism of Hereticks.* §. 4. *Whether the Or-  
dinations of Hereticks and Schismaticks  
may be accepted by the Church without  
Reordination.*

THE



---

THE  
CONTENTS  
OF THE  
APPENDIX.

OR,  
REMARKS on the Au-  
thor of the Second Part  
of LAY-BAPTISM *Invalid.*

---

CHAP. I.

A Short way to end the Contro-  
versy with this Author about  
Unauthorized Baptism, by shewing  
his great Ignorance of the ancient  
Discipline of the Church, whilst he  
supposes the ancient Hereticks to be  
true Authorized Priests, in Actual  
Commision, when the Church had re-  
duced them to the State of Laymen.

CHAP.



---

# The CONTENTS.

---

## CHAP II.

**R**emarks on our Author's Preface.

§. 1. That Unauthorized Baptisms, and Invalid Baptisms are not of the same Import in the Sense of the ancient Church. §. 2. This Author's Reasons for the Validity of Heretical Baptism, very different from those of the Primitive Church. §. 3. His Notions about the Invalidity of Heretical Baptism Unbaptizes the whole Church of England. §. 4. His Exceptions against the New Form of Confirmation, which was proposed to the Convocation, considered. §. 5. He confesses his Mistake in producing Lucifer as a Witness against Lay-Baptism. §. 6. How he confounds Valid Baptism, and Saving Baptism together, against the Sense of the ancient Church. §. 7. That Heretical Baptism is properly Anti-Episcopal, by our Author's own Concessions. §. 8. That our Author's Charge upon his Adversaries, of dissolving the Necessity of the Christian Priesthood, equally reflects upon the Principles and Practice of the whole Catholick Church in all Ages.

CHAP.



---

## The C O N T E N T S.

---

### C H A P. III.

**R**emarks on the First and Second Chapters of our Author's Book.

- §. 1. *That allowing the Baptisms of Usurpers, Hereticks or Schismaticks, to be Valid only so far as not to need Rebaptizing, is not Abetting or Encouraging their Usurpations.*  
§. 2. *That some Discretionary Power was supposed to be in the Hands of Bishops, in Commissioning Persons to baptize.* §. 3. *Whether Deacons were accounted Priests, and the Ordinary and Standing Ministers of Baptism.* §. 4. *That many Uncommissioned Baptisms were anciently Confirmed by Bishops without Rebaptizing.* §. 5. *The necessary Distinction of the Ancients between an Authoritative Baptism and a meerly Valid Baptism, confounded by our Author.*
- 

### C H A P. IV.

**R**emarks on our Author's Account of the Greek Church, and the Churches of the Reformation.

- §. 1. *That the ancient Greek Church had several Laws before the Eighth Century, determining*



---

## The CONTENTS.

---

*termining the Validity of Uncommissioned Lay-Baptism. §. 2. The Authority of the Canons of Nicephorus vindicated from our Author's Exceptions. §. 3. His Disingenuous way of answering the Modern Greek Writers. §. 4. That the Reason of the Greeks Practice was not their Opinion of the absolute Necessity of Baptism for dying Infants. §. 5. Of the Moscovite or Russian Churches. §. 6. No farther Dispute about the Lutheran Churches. §. 7. Nor about Zuinglius and the Helvetian Churches. §. 8. That the Calvinists do in some Cases allow of the Validity of Lay-Baptism. The Conclusion, reducing the whole Controversy to this single Point, Whether the ancient Hereticks and Schismatics were true Authorized Priests in Actual Commission, or only Unauthorized and Uncommissioned Lay-men, Usurping the Priests Office at the time of Baptizing.*







# The State of the Present CONTROVERSY.

**W**HEN I set myself to write the First Part of this Scho-

§. 1.  
*No farther Dispute  
with Dr. Brett about  
the modern Greek  
Church.*

*lastical History of Lay-Baptism,*  
I did it with the same Prospect and View as I have done all other Parts of the *Antiquities of the Church*, only to set Matters in as fair a Light as I could, and inform the Judgment of every Unprejudiced Reader; not without hopes of bringing an Unhappy Controversy to a fair End, by convincing some Learned Persons, who are warmly engaged in the Dispute, that they were under some great Mistakes, in reference to several Points both of Ancient and Modern History. And in some measure I have gained this End, tho' not so perfectly as I hope to do in this



this Second Part, in which I have taken care to give these Gentlemen all imaginable Satisfaction from the most Authentick Rules and Undeniable Practice of the Primitive Church, if the Sense of the first Six General Councils, and the concurrent Testimony of all other Councils and Fathers, be of any Force in such a Case. Our Controversy is now brought within a shorter Compass: For I have no farther Dispute with my Learned Friend Dr. Brett, about the Modern *Greeks* and *Moscovites*. All I have said of them is allowed, only the Doctor complains he had not Books to examine upon this Occasion, nor would the excellent Library of *Canterbury* furnish him with necessary Assistance. I hope his Grace of *Canterbury*, or the Reverend Dean and Chapter, will take his Admonition to furnish their Library with a *Suicerus*, and a *Leunclavius*, a *Hottinger*, and an *Arcudius*, &c. that the Doctor may not be at a loss, when he is obliged to consult them upon any other such Occasion.

## §. 2.

Nor about the Churches of the Reformation.

I have no farther Dispute with the Doctor neither, about the Churches of the Reformation. We are agreed, that the *Lutheran* Churches are all of the same Opinion with the *Greeks*, and allow Lay-Persons to baptize in Cases of Necessity. *Zuinglius* did the same, and his Followers did not much depart from his Opinion. The *Palatine* Churches forbid the Rebaptization of those who are baptized by Laymen in a grand Diffipation of the Church, if *Alting*, an eminent Professor among them, knew their Sense in such an Exigency. The *French* and *Dutch* Churches are of the contrary Opinion, and order all Persons



sons to be Rebaptized that are Baptized by Laymen in any Case whatsoever. *Calvin* was of the same Opinion with *Alting*, That Lay-Baptism might be admitted without Rebaptization in a grand Diffipation of the Church. And what the Doctor quotes from him, only respects Order in a quiet and peaceable State of the Church. The Doctor will have it also, that the *Scotch* Church followed the *French* at the Reformation: And tho' he does not prove it from any piece of their Discipline, or from *Knox*, or any Private Writer; for I think *Knox's* Book of Discipline, in *Bishop Spotswood*, has nothing about it: Yet I will not contend with him about this Particular, having as little Proof against his Assertion as he has for it, and it would be only to fight in the dark, to say any thing farther without Authority upon it.

Thus far then our Dispute seems to be at an end. But there are two Points about which the Doctor is not satisfied, The Sense of the Church of *England*, and the Primitive Church. To what I said about the Church of *England*, he gives a very short Answer, That I have said nothing but what was said some Time before, in a small Pamphlet, called, *The Judgment of the Church of England in the Case of Lay-Baptism*, which was fully answered by *Mr. Lawrence*, to which he therefore Refers his Reader; and only observes further, that I gave the Opinion of Private Men only, and not the Judgment of the Church from any of her Rubricks, Articles or Canons. So that tho' I had alledged a Thousand Authorities more than the little Pamphlet,

§. 3.

How far we are agreed about the Church of England.



called, *The Judgment*, had done, or should now alledge a Thousand more, the same Insinuation, That I had added nothing new, would answer all in a word. For it signifies nothing to this Gentleman to produce the unanimous Consent of Private Writers, in every Age since the Reformation, declaring their Judgment of the Sense of the Church of *England* in this matter. The constant Practice of the Church, which is obvious to every one that has but half an Eye, is of no more weight with him: For unless he sees express Rubricks, Articles, or Canons, forbidding to Rebaptize, he will not believe it to have been the Sense or Judgment of the Church of *England*. So that it is in vain to add any more *Whitgifts*, or *Abbots*, or *Whitakers*, or *Casaubons*, Father or Son, or the Judgment of the Universities, or the Judgment of the Prince in a Conference of Bishops: All these were but Private Men, and cannot tell us what was the Judgment of the Church in their Times. Nay, according to the new Hypothesis, some of them were not baptized Christians, but only in the State of Catechumens: For *Casaubon*, I suppose, was baptized by a *French* Minister, and therefore, according to this Hypothesis, ought to have been Rebaptized when he first joined himself to the Church of *England*. And it has already been observed by others, that the Royal Martyr was baptized by a *Scotch* Presbyter only, and therefore, by the same Hypothesis, ought to have had a new Baptism to make him a compleat Christian. But it is in vain to urge any Absurdities that attend this new Hypothesis: For be the Consequences what they will, or be the Authorities and Testimonies never so full and ample for the Churches Practice, yet  
unless



unless Articles, Rubricks, or Canons be produced, that plainly say such Persons ought not to be Rebaptized, the Gentlemen that maintain the new Hypothesis, resolve never to depart from it. The constant Practice of the Church is not thought sufficient to interpret her Rubricks; nor the concurring Judgment of the Sons of the Church allowed to be any Indication of the sense of their Mother. And therefore if I should here add, that most, if not all, the Bishops of the Present Church, have either Publickly or Privately given their Opinion and Judgment in favour of the Churches general Practice, this would be reckon'd to have no weight, because it is not improved into a Rubrick or Canon of the Church. But a Rubrick or an Article, however misunderstood or wrong applied, is of sufficient Force to bear down all other Authority, whether from General Consent or General Practice. So that I think it in vain to dispute with Dr. Brett, or any other of his way, any longer upon this Head, who refuse to be determined by any other Evidence but such as they think cannot possibly be brought against them: I only take what is allowed, that the general Consent of Private Writers, and the general Practice of the Church interpreting her own Rules, is clearly against them: And then leave the rest to be determined by the Judgment of every ingenuous Reader.

§. 4.

But I have something more to say to my Friend Dr. Brett, about the Sense and Practice of the Primitive Church. For here I intend to give him Satisfaction in his own way, and answer all his

*How far we are agreed about the Primitive Writers.*



Demands, and offer him such Proof and Conviction as will once more try his Ingenuity, whether he will take it kindly to be informed in a matter of Historical Truth, by the Evidence of the plainest Demonstration. I will trouble him now with no Private Writers, but such as are backed by the Authority of General Councils. In the former Discourse I alledged only Private Writers, and those, though they spake never so plain, were all answered in a word, that they delivered only their own Private Sense, and not the Sense of the Church: When the Testimony of *Tertullian* was urged, it was easily turned off, by saying, He only spake his own Opinion. When I added to this the Decree of the Council of *Eliberis*, that is answered by saying, it was not a General, but only a Provincial Council. When it was farther urged, that *Alexander*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, received the Baptisms given by *Athanasius*; that is rejected as a Fable and a meer Hear-say Story, because it had no better Authority than *Sozomen* or *Ruffin*. When I urged the plainest Words imaginable from St. *Jerom*, I am told, that these proceeded only from a Slip of St. *Jerom's* Pen, whilst he transcribed *Tertullian*, and is directly contrary to every other part of his Dialogue against the *Luciferians*. St. *Austin* has no better Quarter, for he is rejected as one that only speaks his Private Opinion, and that built upon a wrong Foundation, viz. The absolute necessity of Baptism to Salvation; which is said neither to be agreeable to the Doctrine of the Catholick Church nor the Church of *England*. And yet St. *Austin* in truth had no other Opinion of the necessity of Baptism in Adult Persons (whatever he might think of Children) but



but what *Cyprian* and *St. Ambrose*, and all the whole Catholick Church had of it before him, and makes the same Allowances, in the Case of Necessity, as the Church of *England* does at this day, as I shall undeniably prove in the next Book of my *Origines*<sup>a</sup>, however the Doctor is so confident to the contrary. But something was necessary to be said to lessen the Character and Authority of *St. Austin*. The same Answer is given to *Gelasius* and *Isidore* of *Sevil*, that the Permission they spake of, as granted in the *Western Church*, to Laymen to baptize in Case of Necessity, was all founded upon the same mistaken Opinion of *St. Austin* about the Absolute Necessity of Baptism, which prevailed by *St. Austin's* great Authority in the *Western Church*. This is the unhappy Method which this Learned Person takes to obviate the Force of my former Dissertation; sometimes lessening the Character of Historians as over credulous; charging others as Writing in a Dream, and letting their Pen run too fast; and others of great and venerable Name, as guilty of Heterodoxy, in running against the general sense of the Catholick Church: And all of them, put together, whether they spake true or false, are no sufficient Evidence of the Practice of the Church, in his Opinion, because they spake no more but their own Private Sense of the matter. And this is a Solution ready at hand for a Thousand Authors, had they been alledged to the same Purpose. So that unless we can produce some General Councils determining the Validity of Lay-Baptism in the Cases under Debate, or at least some Authors of

B 3

in-

<sup>a</sup> Origin. Eccles. Book. 10. Chap. 2. n. 20, &c.



indisputable Credit, that say General Councils have so determined, the Doctor will still find his Evasion, and desire to be excused from yielding his Assent to it. Now some Persons would be apt to complain of this as hard Usage, for Men to require the Evidence of General Councils to determine a matter of Fact on one side, when the other side will not produce a Patriarchal, or a National, or so much as a Provincial Council on the other hand. They would be ready to say, This was to bind heavy Burthens and grievous to be born, and lay them on other Mens Shoulders, whilst they themselves will not touch them with one of their Fingers. But I will make no such Complaint, but gratify my Friend in his Demands, and try whether I cannot convince him, that this matter has been abundantly determined by all the Six General Councils, when I have first examined, how he pretends to prove his Opinion to be agreeable to the general Sense and Practice of the Church.

S. 5.

*Whether St. Basil and the Council of Trullo determine the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, in the Practice of the Church.*

His main Strength is from the Testimony of *St. Basil*, whose Opinion, he says, P. 59. is not to be esteemed a Private Opinion, for the Epistle wherein it is contained is a Canonical Epistle, and received by the *Greek Church* as a Canon, and as such is put into the Canonical Code of that Church, and was so as early as the Sixth Century at least; about which time *Johannes Scholasticus*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, made his Collection of all the Canons then received in that Church, among which are the Canonical Epistles of *St. Basil*. So that when we cite an Epistle of *St. Basil*, we do



do not produce the Authority of a single Father, but of the whole *Greek Church*. This is his Argument, which will do the Doctor's Cause much more harm than good, for if he stands to it, his Cause is utterly lost. I examine not now how early *St. Basil's* Canons were made a part of the *Greek Code*, whether in the time of *Johannes Scholasticus*, who lived Two-hundred Years after *St. Basil*, or afterward: The first General Council that Confirmed them, I believe, was the Council of *Trullo*, *An. 692*. And if they had no compleat Authority till that time, they are no very good Authority or Testimony of the Churches General Practice for the Three-hundred Years foregoing. But what is it that *St. Basil's* Canons are made to testify of the Churches Practice? Is it not first, that Hereticks and Schismaticks were only reputed Laymen? Which is true, not because *St. Basil* said it, or because his Canons were received by the Church two or three hundred Years after they were made, but because the Church has decreed the same thing in all her General Councils, as I have abundantly proved in the following Discourse, not to serve the Doctor's Hypothesis, but to do him more true and useful Service, in setting him right in his Notions about Lay-Baptism, so far as concerns the Churches Practice. For, Secondly, the Church never came in to *St. Cyprian's* or *St. Basil's* Notion in the other part of it, that the Baptisms of Hereticks or Schismaticks, who were only Laymen, or not so good as Laymen, were therefore to be repeated, because they were Laymen; but expressly determined the contrary, that their Baptisms, if given in due Form, were to be received by Imposition of Hands without Rebaptizing, notwithstanding that they were



given by those whom the Church herself accounted no more than Laymen. How then is it possible for *St. Basil's* Canons to testify that to be the Practice of the whole Church, when the Church, in her General Councils, does for her self so evidently testify the contrary? I do not accuse my Friend of Insincerity, but I cannot wholly acquit him of want of a due Sagacity and Judgment, in making *St. Basil* a Witness of the Churches Practice in a Case, wherein the Church always went against him. For tho' she agreed with him in the first Proposition, That Hereticks and Schismatics were no better than Laymen; yet she differed from him in the other Assertion, That therefore the Baptisms of those Laymen (tho' given in due Form) were to be repeated: The one affirmed it, the other denied it: And therefore, unless an Affirmation and a Negation be the same thing, we cannot possibly say, with any colour of Reason or Truth, that *St. Basil's* Canons witness or affirm that to be the General Practice of the Church, which all the Canons of the Church positively deny. But the Ground of the Doctor's Mistake was this; he did not consider, that *St. Basil's* Canons went one way in this particular, and the Canons of the Church another, but hastily concludes, that because *St. Basil's* Canons were received into the Code of the *Greek* Church, and that Two or Three-hundred Years after they were made, therefore the Church Universal must needs always Practice according to those Canons: Whereas this is a very wrong Conclusion: For even when these Canons were received into the Code, the Church did not Practice according to them, but according to her own General Rules, which were directly contrary. Nothing  
can



can be plainer than this from the Council of *Trullo*, which in her second Canon receives the Canons of *St. Basil* among those of *Atbanasius*, *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, and many others: And yet she has a Canon of her own, exprefly contradicting this Canon of *St. Basil*, which fo much weight is laid upon. For her 95th Canon orders fome Hereticks to be received by a new Baptifm, and others only by Imposition of Hands or Confignation. The *Eunomians*, the *Montanifts*, the *Sabellians*, the *Manichees*, the *Valentinians*, the *Marcionites*, the *Paulianifts*, and fuch others were to be Rebaptized, for a Reason that every body knows, Becaufe they obferved not the due Form of Baptifm: But the *Arians*, the *Macedonians*, the *Novatians*, the *Quartadecimans*, the *Apollinarians*, the *Nestorians* and *Eutychians*, are to be received only by Anathematizing their Errors and Confignation. This Canon is plainly contrary to that of *St. Basil*. Now then, if a Man were to judge of the Churches Practice at this time, by one of thefe two Canons, whether of them would it be more proper to take for his Guide, the Canon of *St. Basil*, or the Canon of this General Council? I can hardly think any Man fo weak, as to declare upon a fair Hearing, that this Council intended the obfolete Canon of *St. Basil* fhould take place of their own Canon juft then made, and ftifle it in its very Birth, only becaufe they gave *St. Basil's* Canons a decent Reception in the Lump, as they did many others, which were then no Rules of Practice. Sure it muft be concluded, this Council fpake the fense of the Church at that time in her own Canon; and if other Councils did the fame before her, up to *St. Basil's* Time, and all againft *St. Basil's* Rule, it muft be mon-  
ftrous



strous to conclude what was the Practice of the Church from St. *Basil's* single Canon, rather than from so many Canons of General Councils to the contrary. But the Doctor will ask, What General Council has said, that the Baptisms of Laymen are to be received in any Case without Rebaptizing? I answer, as many as have said that the Baptisms of Hereticks and Schismatics are to be received, when given in due Form, without Rebaptizing. For they had no other Notion of Hereticks and Schismatics, when once Degraded or Excommunicated, but only either as Laymen or worse than Laymen, by being cast out of the Church. This was no Private Opinion of St. *Cyprian* or St. *Basil* (as the other Opinion about Rebaptizing such Hereticks was) but it is the Voice of the Church in all her General Councils: It is confirmed by the Decrees and Sanctions of almost every Patriarchal, National, Provincial Council: It runs through the Writings of every Catholick Father, who all combine in this one Point against Hereticks and Schismatics, That they are no longer true Authorized Priests of God, but only Laymen, or a Degree below Laymen, as I shall abundantly shew the Doctor in the sequel of this Discourse. The plain consequence of which is, That the Church in ordering the Baptisms of such Hereticks and Schismatics to be received, must needs receive the Baptisms of Unauthorized Laymen, because she received the Baptisms of those whom she either made Laymen, or accounted them so to be, as is irrefragably proved in the following Discourse. The Controversy now is brought into a short compass, it turns all upon this one Point at present, Whether Hereticks and Schismatics be true Authorized Priests of



of GOD, that can never be divested of their Authority by vertue of an Indelible Character? Or whether, by their Apostacy, and the Churches Censure, they are not rather divested of all Ministerial Authority, and reduced to the State of Laymen, or one Degree below Laymen that continue in the Church? When I have determined this Point by the best Authority in the Church, by the Acts and Canons of the first six General Councils, and by such Arguments as are proper to be urged in this Case, my Learned Friend and I shall have no longer occasion to dispute about this or that Private Author, which will signify little to be urged on either side, against the whole Stream and Current of the Catholick Church. If I do not satisfy him by this plain History, let him give me better Proofs for the contrary Part, and I will promise him, in Point of History, to become his Convert.

But before I have done with *St. Basil*, I will make the Doctor two or three more Observations out of him, which are obvious enough, tho' he did not think fit to observe them. As first, That *St. Basil*, or at least *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian*, whose Opinion he relates, were not possess'd with the Modern Notion of the Indelible Character of a Priest: They thought, that when a Bishop or a Presbyter turned Hereticks or Schismaticks, they were no longer Priests, but Laymen; not like Laymen, or Parallel to them, tho' that were enough, but perfectly and entirely Laymen, and no Priests: Which is the Foundation of their Argument for Rebaptizing those that were baptized by them. Their Words are very expresse, *λαϊκοὶ γενόμενοι*, that Hereticks and Schismaticks, by breaking off from the Church, become Laymen, and therefore have not the

Au-



Authority of Priests any longer. Now if we suppose, with the Doctor, that St. *Basil's* Canons were entirely confirmed by the Church Universal, then it is evident the modern Notion of an Indelible Character was no Doctrine of the Catholick Church, no more than it was of St. *Basil*; but that a Bishop or a Priest may forfeit his Episcopal or Sacerdotal Authority and Power, and be reduced, by the Discipline of the Church for his Crimes, whether Heresy, Schism, or other Crimes, to the State and Condition of Laymen; which I have proved to be true, not because St. *Basil* said it, or because his Canons were received by the Church, but because it was the constant and avowed Doctrine and Discipline of the Church Universal.

2. Whence it follows, *Secondly*, that such Priests, having lost their Authority, could have no more Power than Laymen to baptize, as St. *Basil* rightly observes, and that consonantly enough to the Sense and received Opinion of the Catholick Church, of which I shall give a full Account in the following Discourse.

3. And yet I observe, *3<sup>dly</sup>*, That as to the particular Case of Schismatics, whom St. *Basil* reckons Laymen as well as Hereticks, tho' in his own private Opinion he was for Rebaptizing them as well as Hereticks, yet he is not stiff to that Opinion, but thinks the Custom of the Church in every Country ought to be complied with, whether it were to Baptize, or not Baptize them again. And he particularly applies this to the Case of the *Novatians*, and such other Schismatics as did not err in Faith, and were not wholly broken off from the Church in Fundamentals. Therefore since many Churches in *Asia* received the Baptism of such by way of Dispen-



Dispensation, he is not against the receiving of it. So that, in his Opinion, if the Church thinks fit to receive Lay-Baptism, it is in her Power to admit of it. And so he determines not only in his first Canon, but in the forty seventh also, in the Case of the *Encratitæ*.

4. And therefore I observe in the last place, That according to these Rules of *St. Basil*, the Decrees of General Councils and the common Consent and Practice of the Church in these Matters were to be complied with. So that the Council of *Nice* having received the Baptism of the *Novatians*, tho' they were both in *St. Basil's* Opinion, and in Reality, but Laymen; and the Council of *Constantinople*, not long after *St. Basil's* Death, having determined the same about the *Novatians* and several others; in all such Churches as submitted to the Authority of those Councils, no further Dispute was to be made about this Matter, but either the Directions of the Councils, or the Custom of every Church was to be regarded by all Private Men, and no Disturbance to be made upon this Point of Discipline. All which things considered, it cannot be concluded from *St. Basil's* Canons, or their Reception in the Church, that Laymens Baptism was generally annulled; but we must necessarily conclude the contrary, That since Hereticks and Schismatics, both in the Opinion of *St. Basil* and the Church, were generally voted to be Laymen; and yet the Baptisms of these Laymen were generally received by Publick Orders of the Church; that therefore the general Practice of the Church was, to receive the Baptisms of Laymen, if given in due Form, without Rebaptizing. So unhappy is my Learned Friend in his Conclusions from the ancient



cient Fathers, to urge that for his Cause which directly proves the contrary.

§. 6.

*An Account of the  
Luciferian Heresy.  
And whether St. Je-  
rom be a Witness of  
the Churches Annul-  
ling the Baptism of  
Laymen in Ordinary  
Cases.*

Let us see whether he be any happier in his other great Pillar and Support of his Cause, which is St. *Jerom*. The Doctor does not pretend that St. *Jerom* was wholly on his Side, but only in one Point. He owns St. *Jerom*

allowed Laymen to baptize in Case of Necessity: But then he says he contradicted himself, and spake not the sense of the Church neither, but only the Private Opinion of *Tertullian* against the Church; tho' St. *Jerom* speaks in Terms plain enough, *Quod frequenter, si tamen necessitas cogit, scimus etiam licere Laicis*, We know that it is frequently allowed to Laymen to baptize, when Necessity requires it. This sure was not the Allowance of *Tertullian*, or St. *Jerom*, but the Allowance of the Church, which Authorized Laymen to do it frequently in such Extraordinary Cases. Or if they did it frequently without her Authority, it is not to be imagined but that the Church should have made some Decree against it, especially when St. *Austin* and the Council of *Eliberis* and several others, had declared for it. Here was reason enough to expect some General Council should have interposed her Authority (as she did in another Case against the *Cyprianists*) and have forbidden Laymen to baptize in any Case whatsoever, if it had been against the Sense and Discipline of the Church to allow it. But the Doctor does not pretend to give us any General Council to this purpose. But still he will have it, that the Church al-



always Rebaptized those that were Baptized by Laymen in Ordinary Cases, and that St. *Ferom* herein is a Witness of the Churches Practice. Now, to convince the Doctor of his Mistake, I will only ask him two plain Questions. 1. Whether the Church ever made any General Decree for Rebaptizing such as were Baptized in due Form by Hereticks and Schismatics; or whether St. *Ferom* ever speaks of any such Decree? I know my Learned Friend will not assert this, because I have proved the contrary before to his Satisfaction. I ask then, 2<sup>dly</sup>, Whether the Church, by any General Council, ever declared, that Hereticks and Schismatics, whilst they remained Hereticks and Schismatics, were true Authorized Priests of God, or whether St. *Ferom* ever alledges any such Decree? If he says there are such Declarations and Decrees of General Councils, it will be easy to produce them, as I have done abundance to the contrary in the following Discourse. But if he can produce none that say this, but all unanimously, on the contrary, declare, that Hereticks and Schismatics, are no longer true Priests of God, but Laymen, or of a lower Order than Laymen in the Church; then it inevitably follows, that the Church, in ordering the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismatics to be received, ordered the Baptism of those to be received, who were no more than Laymen, in her Opinion. If he says, St. *Ferom* is a Witness, that the Church esteemed Hereticks and Schismatics to be true Priests of God, it will be easy to produce his Testimony: But then, all that will be gained by it, will be only this, that St. *Ferom* contradicts the General Councils, and delivers a Private mistaken Opinion of his own, which, in  
that



that Case, can be no sufficient Testimony or Evidence of the Churches Sense, against the clearer and stronger Evidence of her General Councils.

This, without any more ado, will be allowed to be a sufficient Answer to any thing the Doctor has produced or can produce out of St. *Ferom's* Dialogue against the *Luciferians*. And so I might here put an end to the Dispute about it. But because that Dialogue is a very intricate Discourse, in the former part of it, and the Doctor has chosen that part of it to be the Foundation of his Assertion, I will, for the satisfaction of the Learned Reader, make a little farther Enquiry into the Design of that Dialogue; and state, as fully and exactly as I can, the Case between St. *Ferom* and the *Luciferians*. The first Rise of the *Luciferian* Schism is well known to have proceeded from the inflexible Stifness and Rigour of *Lucifer* Bishop of *Caralis* in *Sardinia*, who having been a Confessor for the Faith against the *Arians*, in the Time of *Constantius*, thought it unreasonable, when the Persecution was over, that those 300 Bishops, who had so far complied with the *Arians*, in the Council of *Ariminum*, as to consent to the dropping of the Word *Consubstantial* out of the Creed, should be allowed to continue in their Places any longer, as having, in his Opinion, betray'd the Faith and the Cause of the Catholick Church. Hereupon, as soon as the Council of *Alexandria*, under *Athanasius*, An. 362. had determined to receive these Bishops again in their Station, because they found no just Reason to Depose them; *Lucifer* offended at this, in his over-righteous and over-wise Zeal made a Separation from the Church, and would no longer Communicate  
either



either with those Lapsed Bishops, or those that received them; declaring that the whole Catholick Church was become an Apostatizing Harlot, and the Synagogue of Antichrist for receiving them. This occasioned several Questions to be debated by St. *Ferom*; some of which he answers Categorically and Directly, and also upon Catholick Principles; others only Hypothetically, in pursuance of his Adversaries Suppositions or Assertions; and in these last he does not always speak his own Sense, or the Sense of the Church, but only shews his Adversary what must follow upon the advancement of such a false Principle or Assertion, to drive him to an Absurdity. If Men will not carefully distinguish these things, it is impossible to understand this Dialogue of St. *Ferom*, or make the Sense of one part of it consistent with another.

Now the Questions proposed were such as these:

1. Whether the *Arians* and other Hereticks were Heathens? This the *Luciferians* affirmed, but St. *Ferom* denied.

2. Whether upon this Supposition of their being Heathens, they could give such a Christian Baptism as needed not to be repeated? This the *Luciferians* affirmed, but St. *Ferom* positively denied upon that Supposition: For no Heathen, none but a Baptized Person could give Christian Baptism. And yet when the Question was otherwise proposed,

3. Whether an *Arian* Heretick, considered absolutely as a Baptized Person, and not upon  
C the



the *Luciferian* Supposition of being a meer Heathen, could give such a Baptism as needed not to be repeated by the Church? Then St. *Ferom* not only affirmed, but maintained it from Scripture and Councils, that Heretical Baptism, when given in due Form, was not to be repeated. By which we may see, that St. *Ferom* affirmed and denied the same thing, upon different Suppositions, without any Contradiction.

4. The next Question was, Whether any beside a Priest could baptize? The *Luciferian* asserted, any Man, an *Arian*, that is, in his Opinion, an Heathen, one that was no Priest, nor Christian, might baptize. But St. *Ferom* denied all this, and asserted, that it was necessary a Man should in some sense be a Christian Priest, to qualify him to Baptize. But he distinguishes a double Notion of the Priesthood, and Cases Ordinary from Extraordinary. There is the *Sacerdotium Laici*, as he calls it, *The Priesthood of a Layman*, that is, his Baptism, as well as the Priesthood of a Clerk, which qualified the one to administer Baptism in Extraordinary Cases, as the other did in Ordinary. And without a Priesthood of one sort or other, there could be no Ministration of Baptism. Therefore if the *Arians* were Heathen, as the *Luciferian* asserted, their Laicks were to be Rebaptized as *Gentiles*; since an Heathen could not be a Priest either in the strict or the large Notion of a Priest, nor consequently Baptize either in Ordinary or Extraordinary Cases. Here again St. *Ferom* disputes Hypothetically upon the Principles and Assertions of the *Luciferians*.

5. Ano-



5. Another Question was, Whether any Man could administer Baptism, who could not give Remission of Sins, and the Spirit with it. The *Luciferian* affirms it, but St. *Ferom* denies it. And here, I confess, I am at a loss to understand St. *Ferom*'s Reasoning, and make him speak agreeably to the Doctrine of the Catholic Church: And if my Learned Friend will help me out, he will do both me and St. *Ferom* a piece of Service. For I am sure St. *Austin* always argues against the *Cyprianists* and the *Donatists* upon a contrary Notion, That a true Baptism might be given without Remission of Sins or the Spirit accompanying it. For Hereticks had not Power to give either Remission of Sins or the Spirit. This was the Deficiency of their Baptism; and for this Reason all the Councils ordered Hereticks to receive Imposition of Hands upon their return to the Church, that they might receive Remission of Sins and the Spirit, which they could not receive before in Heretical Baptism; as I have abundantly proved before in the First Part of my *Scholastical History*, which the Doctor does not pretend to call in Question. How therefore to reconcile St. *Ferom*'s Notion to the Rule of the Church, in this particular, is beyond my Skill at present, and I will thank any one that will do it for me.

6. Another Question, which indeed is the Principal and Leading Question in this whole Dialogue, tho' it was only about a Matter of Fact, was, Whether the Bishops of the Council of *Ariminum* were really *Arians* or not? The *Luciferian* affirmed it, but *Ferom* utterly denies



it, and proves clearly from the History and Acts of the Council then extant, and to which he appeals, that they were all Catholick Bishops, and only subscribed a Catholick Creed in a Catholick Sense: But *Ursatius* and *Valens*, two deceitful and crafty *Arian* Bishops, had prevailed upon them, with fair Words, to leave the Word, *Consubstantial*, out of the Creed, for the sake of Peace, pretending that then all would be well, and there would be no more Disputes about Religion. Which they had no sooner done, but these deceitful *Arians* immediately gave out and boasted, that they had destroyed the *Nicene* Faith. Which as soon as the Bishops of *Ariminum* came to understand, they with Tears detested and abhorred the Fraud, declaring, by all that is Sacred, they never intended to make an *Arian* Creed, as these Miscreants gave out against them. Then *ingemuit totus Orbis, & Ariminum se esse miratus est*; which does not mean, as it is vulgarly misunderstood, that these 300 Bishops were *Arians*, or that the World was turned *Arian* with them, but that these Bishops were really grieved, that they should, by such a Trick, be brought under the suspicion of *Arianism*, who never intended any such thing. Thus St. *Jerom* does Justice to these Catholick Bishops, in freeing them from the Imputation of *Arianism*, which *Lucifer*, after *Ursatius* and *Valens*, had cast upon them. He owns they were to blame for leaving out the Word *Consubstantial*, which the *Nicene* Council had made the Barrier of the Faith; but that they had established an *Arian* Creed he utterly denies: And therefore he vindicates the Church against *Lucifer*, in allowing them to continue in their Station.



Station. "For why (says he) should they have  
 "condemned those who were not *Arians*?  
 "Why should they divide the Church<sup>b</sup>, whilst  
 "it continued in the Unity of the Faith? Why  
 "should they by their Obstinacy make those  
 "become *Arians*, who were really Orthodox  
 "Believers? The Council of *Alexandria* (he  
 "adds) upon this Account only condemned the  
 "Authors of the Heresy, who were not to be  
 "excused; but received the rest upon their Re-  
 "pentance: Not as if they could have been  
 "Bishops, if they had been Hereticks; but be-  
 "cause it was so manifest, that those who were  
 "received, never had been Hereticks.

In these last Words St. *Ferom* seems to me to determine two other Questions, which were,

7. Whether, upon supposition that those Bishops had been really profest *Arians*, they ought to have been esteemed true Bishops whilst they were Hereticks? And,

8. Whether, in strictness of Discipline, the Church would or could have received them to the Station of Bishops again, upon the Renunciation of their Heresy, without breaking in upon her own ordinary standing Rule, which was, to deprive all such as fell into Heresy, of  
 C 3 the

---

<sup>b</sup> *Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucif. cap. 7.* Cur damnassent eos qui Arianism non erant? Cur Ecclesiam scinderent, in Concordia Fidei permanentem? Cum (lege cur) denique credentes bene, obstinatione sua facerent Arianos? ----- In Alexandrina Synodo constitutum est, ut exceptis auctoribus hæreseos, quos error excusare non poterat, pœnitentes Ecclesiæ sociarentur: Non quod Episcopi possint esse, qui hæretici fuerant; sed quod constaret eos, qui reciperentur, hæreticos non fuisse.



the Office of Bishops and the Clerical Priesthood? St. *Jerom* seems to me, plainly to determine these two Questions in the Negative, in those Words, *Non quod Episcopi esse possint, qui Hæretici fuerant*, They could not ordinarily be allowed to be Bishops who had been Hereticks. For this I shall shew to be exactly agreeable to the Common and Ordinary Rules of the Church, which were, Neither to allow of Hereticks as true Bishops or Priests, whilst they were Hereticks; nor yet, in strictness of Discipline, to admit them as Bishops or Priests upon their Return to the Catholick Church, but only to allow them to Communicate in the Quality of Laymen.

9. But then there was another main Question, upon which St. *Jerom* and the *Luciferian* are absolutely divided, which was, Whether the Church, for Weighty and Prudential Reasons, could not dispense with the Strictness and Rigour of her own Ordinary Rule of Discipline? that is, Whether the Church, if she thought fit, could not give Authority to an Heretical Bishop, to act as a Bishop again, upon his Return from his Heresy to the Church. This was stiffly denied by *Lucifer*, and it was the thing he grounded his Schism upon. But St. *Jerom*, with a great deal of Reason and Eloquence, maintains this Dispensing Power of the Church, and her Prudence in receding sometimes from the Rigour of Discipline, upon just and proper Occasions. He argues this, *Chap. 2.* from the Practice of the *Luciferians* themselves, who admitted *Arian* Laymen without Rebaptizing them, upon a Prudential Reason, because no one would be converted, if he knew he must be Rebaptized; and so they should have been the Cause of their Ruin,



if they had absolutely rejected them. Hence St. *Ferom* argues, That if such a Concession was made in receiving a Layman, to save a single Soul, there was much more Reason to do it, in receiving of a Bishop, who, by his Return, might unite not only a City, but a whole Province to the Church; but if he was refused, he might draw many others with him into Destruction. He argues farther, *Chap. 7.* from the Example of the *Nicene Council*, which allowed Eight *Arian* Bishops to continue in their Places, when they might have rejected them without any danger to the Church: And it were much, if the Church should not be obliged to do that to save the whole World, which the Council of *Nice* did voluntarily, when she had no such Fear or Concern upon her. So that, according to St. *Ferom*, the Church had Power to receive Lapsing Bishops to their Station again, if Prudential Reasons required it, tho' this was receding a little from the ordinary Discipline in the Exactness and Rigour of it. And this was the Grand Debate betwixt *Lucifer* and the Church. *Lucifer* would make no Allowance or Abatement for Extraordinary Occasions, but was for standing stiff to the Rule prefixt for Ordinary Cases, whatever was the Consequence.

10. And this drew him into another great Error, That the whole Church was polluted and prophaned by receiving those Bishops, whom he thought *Arians*, into their Office and Station again. This made the whole World become the Devils Possession, and turned the Church into an Harlot's House, and the Synagogue of Satan, and there were no true Christians left but in the Isle of *Sardinia*, where *Lucifer* governed them. This strange Uncharitable Opinion St. *Ferom* excel-



excellently refutes and exposes in the First and Eighth Chapters of his Dialogue.

II. *Hilary* the Roman Deacon went one step farther, and added to all this, that the Church was not only polluted, but that all that were Baptized by Hereticks, were of Necessity to be Rebaptized again in order to make them Christians. Which was more than his Master *Lucifer* had asserted. Against this St. *Ferom* disputes in the Two last Chapters of his Dialogue, from the Authority of Scripture, and the Council of *Nice*, and the Practice of the Church, and the Authority of *Lucifer* himself, who received those that were Baptized by the *Arians*, tho' he would not consent to receive the Clergy to their ancient Station. Which shews, that when St. *Ferom* disputes against the Baptism of the *Arians* in the former part of the Dialogue, he speaks not absolutely his own or the Churches Sense, but only discourses Hypothetically upon the Principles, Suppositions and Assertions of his Adversaries, to shew them the Absurdities and unreasonable Consequences of their Opinions; if, as they said, the *Arians* were Heathens, then they ought to Rebaptize those that were Baptized by them; for no Heathen could give Christian Baptism.

'Tis by this Key, by carefully distinguishing what St. *Ferom* speaks absolutely, as his own plain Opinion, from what he discourses only Hypothetically upon the Opinions of his Adversaries, that any one must pretend to understand the easy part of his Discourse; and for that which is extremely difficult in it, as I pretend not to be Master of it, so I had rather be a Disciple than a Teacher to others, in what I profess not to understand; as I do not that part of his Discourse, where he seems to say there  
can



can be no true Baptism without Remission of Sins and the Gift of the Spirit, which I cannot reconcile with the Sense of the Catholick Church, nor with the Validity of Heretical Baptism, which St. *Ferom* himself pleads for against *Hilary* the Deacon. Nor can I reconcile some other intricate Discourse of his with the *Luciferian*, to the common known Rules and Practice of the Church, which yet my Learned Friend takes to be plain Indications, not only of his own Opinion, but also of the Church with him, That Lay-Baptism, in Ordinary Cases, is wholly Null and Void. Nay, he is so confident as to say, P. 63. "If it is not demonstrable  
" from that Dialogue, that St. *Ferom* maintained  
" the Baptism of Laymen (in Ordinary Cases at  
" least, howsoever it might possibly be allowed  
" in Extraordinary Cases ) not only to be Un-  
" lawful, but also wholly Invalid, and conse-  
" quently to be Repeated, he will yield the  
" Cause."

Now one would expect presently to see as plain Words for this, as I had given for the Lawfulness of Laymen's Baptizing in Cases of Necessity: But in vain; for all the Doctor pretends to alledge, is not the Assertion in plain Terms, but some little Appearance of it from two or three Passages of St. *Ferom*, where it is not certain whether he speaks absolutely either his own Sense, or the Churches Sense, but only Hypothetically upon the Suppositions of his Adversaries. The thing which the Doctor labours to demonstrate out of St. *Ferom*, is, That the *Arian* Bishops were true Bishops, and not Laymen: For otherwise he knows not how to justify the Churches receiving such as were baptized by them without Rebaptizing. Now I cannot



cannot but observe, in the first place, that he is the most unfortunate Man in the World at Demonstration: For he brings two Demonstrations which contradict and destroy one another. Not long ago we heard him demonstrating, out of St. *Basil*, and that in the Name of the whole Church, that all Hereticks and Schismatics are only Laymen; and here we have him Demonstrating out of St. *Ferom*, and that in the Name of the Church too, that the *Arian* Hereticks are true Bishops and Priests, and not Laymen. Now how will these things consist together? What Distinction in the Schools can free them from a Contradiction? And whether must the Reader hearken to the Doctor Demonstrating out of St. *Basil* or St. *Ferom*? For my part, I have already said, that I think his Demonstration out of St. *Basil* comes nearer the Churches Sense of Hereticks and Schismatics, that they were not esteemed Bishops and Priests, but only Laymen; not because the Doctor has solidly proved it, but because I have, in this Discourse, more substantially done it for him. And this is a sufficient Prejudice against his pretended Demonstration out of St. *Ferom*, in the Opinion of any Wise and Sober Man, and might be a justifiable Reason for Dismissing it without any farther Examination. But, because my Friend shall not complain of my Incivility, that I would not give both his Demonstrations a fair Hearing, and because it will be of some use to the Learned Reader to set all things right about St. *Ferom*, I will examine it a little more closely, and here follow the Doctor, *κατὰ ποσά.*

He says, P. 64. "If St. *Ferom*'s main Topick  
 "on which he builds all his Arguments, was  
 "not then the known Sense and Practice of the  
 Catho-



“Catholick Church, his Controversy with the  
“*Luciferian* was about his own Private Opinion.”

And so it might be for any thing the Doctor has said to the contrary. For I have shewed before, that in one Point St. *Ferom* plainly maintained a Private Opinion against the Sense of the Church, when he said, there could be no true Baptism without Remission of Sins and the Grace of the Spirit conferred therein, which tends to disannul all Heretical Baptisms whatsoever. And if St. *Ferom* maintained a Private Opinion in this Point, why might he not do so in any other, and particularly in the Point of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, if that had been really his Opinion, as I think it really was not?

But he says, this was not only his Opinion, “but the main Point which he defended, *viz.*  
“The Invalidity of Lay-baptism, and that such  
“as had been so Invalidly Baptized, ought to  
“receive the true Baptism of the Church: And  
“hence, he says, it follows that this Doctrine  
“was at that time the known Sense and Pra-  
“ctice of the Catholick Church.” Whether  
this was the Sense and Practice of the Catholick Church, we shall see more hereafter: At present I only observe, that the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism was not the main Point defended by St. *Ferom*, if it was defended at all. For any one that reads the Account I have given before of the Questions debated by St. *Ferom*, will easily perceive, that the main Point of all, and the very Leading Question to all the rest was, Whether the Bishops of the Council of *Ariminum* were really *Arian* Hereticks or not? And next to that was, Whether there was any Dispensing Power in the Catholick Church to receive such Bishops as lapsed into the *Arian* Heresy, into  
any



cannot but observe, in the first place, that he is the most unfortunate Man in the World at Demonstration: For he brings two Demonstrations which contradict and destroy one another. Not long ago we heard him demonstrating, out of *St. Basil*, and that in the Name of the whole Church, that all Hereticks and Schismaticks are only Laymen; and here we have him Demonstrating out of *St. Jerom*, and that in the Name of the Church too, that the *Arian* Hereticks are true Bishops and Priests, and not Laymen. Now how will these things consist together? What Distinction in the Schools can free them from a Contradiction? And whether must the Reader hearken to the Doctor Demonstrating out of *St. Basil* or *St. Jerom*? For my part, I have already said, that I think his Demonstration out of *St. Basil* comes nearer the Churches Sense of Hereticks and Schismaticks, that they were not esteemed Bishops and Priests, but only Laymen; not because the Doctor has solidly proved it, but because I have, in this Discourse, more substantially done it for him. And this is a sufficient Prejudice against his pretended Demonstration out of *St. Jerom*, in the Opinion of any Wise and Sober Man, and might be a justifiable Reason for Dismissing it without any farther Examination. But, because my Friend shall not complain of my Incivility, that I would not give both his Demonstrations a fair Hearing, and because it will be of some use to the Learned Reader to set all things right about *St. Jerom*, I will examine it a little more closely, and here follow the Doctor, *κατὰ πόδα*.

He says, P. 64. "If *St. Jerom's* main Topick  
 "on which he builds all his Arguments, was  
 "not then the known Sense and Practice of the  
 Catho-



“Catholick Church, his Controversy with the  
“*Luciferian* was about his own Private Opinion.”

And so it might be for any thing the Doctor has said to the contrary. For I have shewed before, that in one Point St. *Ferom* plainly maintained a Private Opinion against the Sense of the Church, when he said, there could be no true Baptism without Remission of Sins and the Grace of the Spirit conferred therein, which tends to disannul all Heretical Baptisms whatsoever. And if St. *Ferom* maintained a Private Opinion in this Point, why might he not do so in any other, and particularly in the Point of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, if that had been really his Opinion, as I think it really was not?

But he says, this was not only his Opinion, “but the main Point which he defended, viz.  
“The Invalidity of Lay-baptism, and that such  
“as had been so Invalidly Baptized, ought to  
“receive the true Baptism of the Church: And  
“hence, he says, it follows that this Doctrine  
“was at that time the known Sense and Pra-  
“ctice of the Catholick Church.” Whether

this was the Sense and Practice of the Catholick Church, we shall see more hereafter: At present I only observe, that the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism was not the main Point defended by St. *Ferom*, if it was defended at all. For any one that reads the Account I have given before of the Questions debated by St. *Ferom*, will easily perceive, that the main Point of all, and the very Leading Question to all the rest was, Whether the Bishops of the Council of *Ariminum* were really *Arian* Hereticks or not? And next to that was, Whether there was any Dispensing Power in the Catholick Church to receive such Bishops as lapsed into the *Arian* Heresy, into  
any



any Clerical Station in the Church again? These were the principal and leading Questions in the whole Debate, and the rest only followed upon them: As whether the *Arians* and all other Hereticks were meer Heathens? Whether upon that Supposition, the Baptism of Hereticks was valid, and not rather to be repeated? Whether any but a Christian Priest could administer Christian Baptism, &c. Therefore the Doctor is mistaken in saying, the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism was the main Point in Dispute, which was no Dispute at all, but only Hypothetical. And he would have done well, instead of blaming me for not carefully reading and considering St. *Jerom's* Dialogue, or not exactly stating the Dispute with the *Luciferians*, to have demonstrated to his Reader, that he had been more careful and exactly Judicious in reading it himself, by giving his Reader a full and accurate Account of the whole Matter, which would have been of more use than his two other pretended Demonstrations.

But there is one thing, tho' not very material to the Cause, I must blame the Doctor for by the way, which is, that he sometimes misrepresents me, as here he makes me say, The *Arian* Priests only were meer Heathens; whereas the word, *only*, is thrust in from his own Invention: for I had no Intention to say, the Dispute was about the Priests only, or about the *Arian* Hereticks exclusive of all others. Again he says, *Pag. 66.* "I make it the main Point in Controversy, whether the *Arians* were meer Heathens, when indeed it was no more than a thing heedlessly asserted by the *Luciferian*, and what he yielded up immediately, and therefore the Merits of the Cause did not depend upon



“ upon it.” To which I must answer, That my Words are here changed again, *A main Point*, for *one Point*, only to make them a Point of Dispute to no purpose; which kind of Writing I desire my Friend to forbear for the future.

But how does it appear that the Merits of the Cause, on the side of the *Luciferian*, no ways depended upon that Point? Why, the Doctor says, he maintains his Cause after he had entirely given that up. Which shews how negligent my Friend was in considering the whole Scope of St. *Hieron's* Dialogue, at the same time that he accuses me of want of Care in reading it. For, first, this very Point comes again in Play, and is argued upon, *pro* and *con*, by the two Disputants, in the fifth Chapter of the Dialogue. The *Luciferian* pleads <sup>c</sup> that an *Arian* Layman might be pardoned, because in the simplicity of his Heart he took the *Arian* Church to be the Church of God, and so came thither to be baptized, believing in his own Faith. To which the Orthodox replies, You surprize me with strange News, in asserting, That a Man may be made a Christian by one who himself was no Christian. Does not this still go upon the *Luciferian* Supposition, that the *Arians* were no Christians, but Heathens? But suppose again, this Point had been entirely given up by *Helladius*; the Doctor might have known that this *Helladius*, the *Luciferian* Disputant, not only gives up this Point, but all other Points in Dispute,

---

<sup>c</sup> Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucif. cap. 5. Laico ideo ignoscendum est, quia Ecclesiam Dei putans, simpliciter accessit, & juxta Fidem suam credens baptizatus est. Orthodox. Novam rem asseris, ut Christianus quisquam factus sit ab eo qui non est Christianus.



pute, by degrees one after another, before he comes to the end of the Dialogue as owning himself Convicted and Converted by his Opponent. And will the Doctor hence conclude, that these were none of them Points of Dispute between the Catholicks and *Luciferians*, because this single *Luciferian* happened to give them all up entirely upon his Conviction? I believe if Dr. Brett should happen to give me up all the Points in Debate between us in this Book, as he has done one or two already, his Friends would hardly allow there were no Points of Dispute remaining, because of his Concessions or Conversion. And yet this is the way the Doctor takes to make his Reader believe I was plainly mistaken in stating the Controversy between St. Jerom and the *Luciferians*.

But let us leave Skirmishing, and come to that Point which the Doctor calls the Merits of the Cause, and upon this join Issue with him. He says, P. 66. "That the Publick avowed Doctrine and Practice of the *Luciferian* Sect, was  
 "to receive the *Arians* upon the renouncing  
 "their Heresy by Penance, and not by Baptism,  
 "and receiving them all as Laymen, none as  
 "Clergymen: In which Doctrine and Practice  
 "they differed from the Orthodox, who received the *Arian* Laymen as Laymen, and their  
 "Clergy as Clergy, according to the Orders  
 "they had received during their Heresy: So  
 "that an *Arian* Bishop; if he came over to the  
 "Church, was still reputed a Bishop, a Priest,  
 "a Priest; and a Deacon, a Deacon. Whereas  
 "if an *Arian* Bishop, Priest or Deacon came  
 "over to the *Luciferians*, he was reputed to be  
 "but a meer Layman.



The Doctor calls this the right State of the Matter, but he quotes no Author for it, and he did well, for he had none for some Parts of it, which are only his own Imagination and Invention, for want of an exact Understanding the Discipline of the ancient Church. What he says of the *Luciferians* is true; they admitted no *Arian* Bishops, Priests or Deacons, but only in the Quality of Laymen: But then it is not true that the Church always, on the other hand, admitted *Arian* Bishops, Priests and Deacons to the same Station they had before, and much less all other Hereticks and Schismatics whatsoever. For she very frequently denied them this Privilege, and by the strictness of her Ordinary Rules was obliged to do it; and therefore she very often reduced them entirely, by exact Discipline, to meer Lay-Communion, and reputed them no other than Laymen, neither before, while they continued in Heresy, nor after their Return to the Church, as the Doctor will find it fully made out in the following Discourse, and I doubt not to his Content and Satisfaction. This therefore could not be the Dispute the Church had with the *Luciferians*. But the Question was, Whether the Church was so tied to this Rule of Discipline in the exact Rigour and Strictness of it, as that she could not, for any Prudential Reason, or upon any extraordinary Occasion dispense therewith, so as to allow an *Arian* Bishop or other Heretick to become a Bishop of the Catholick Church without polluting her own Communion? *Lucifer* said, "The Church had no such dispensing Power to be exercised on any Occasion." And therefore he broke Communion with the Church, for receiving those 300 Bishops of the Council of *Ariminum*, whom he thought



thought worthy of Degradation, as *Arian* Hereticks. But the Church maintained her own Liberty and Power to dispense with this Rule upon just and proper Occasions: And therefore, as in some Cases she refused to receive *Arians* and other Hereticks among her Clergy, so when in Prudence and Charity she found it requisite, she dispensed with her Ordinary Rule, and took them in at Discretion. This aggrieved *Lucifer*, and that was the occasion of his Schism: He was for rejecting all Hereticks; the Church was for rejecting or receiving them at Discretion: He denied the Churches Power absolutely in this Matter; the Church maintained her own Power and Liberty to act in the Affair, as Prudential Reasons and the Exigencies of the Church should require and direct her. Therefore she did not receive *Arian* Bishops, or any other Heretical Bishops, promiscuously in the State they were in, as the Doctor represents, but only as the Exigency of Affairs required: She sometimes dispensed with her Rule, but more commonly reduced them to Lay-Communion; As the Doctor might have learned from the Canons of the Church, and even from St. *Jerom* himself in this Dialogue, if he had not (as usual) been too hasty in making his Conclusions. For, as I have observed before, St. *Jerom* says, in the 7th Chapter of this Dialogue, That in Strictness of Discipline none were allowed to be Bishops in the Church, who had once been Hereticks. Therefore the admitting them was not a thing of Course, or Necessity, or Universal Practice, but only done by way of Dispensation with the Ordinary Rule, as a matter of Grace and Favour, or Expediency, as Prudence directed upon proper Occasions; of which the Church  
always



always made herself Judge, and reserved to herself the Liberty of acting this way or that way, as she thought most expedient; which *Lucifer*, in his stiffness and moroseness, would not allow. This was the true state of this Matter, whatever the Doctor has suggested to the contrary.

Now then let us see how St. *Jerom* argues with the *Luciferian* in behalf of this Liberty and Power of the Church, and what advantage the Doctor would fain make of his Argumentation. "Tell me, says St. *Jerom*, why you receive a Layman coming over from the *Arians*, and do not receive a Bishop?" The *Luciferian* answers, "I receive a Layman, because he confesses that he has erred, and the Lord desireth the Repentance, and not the Death of a Sinner." "And I, says the Orthodox Christian, receive a Bishop, because he confesses that he has erred, and the Lord desireth the Repentance, and not the Death of a Sinner." The *Luciferian* answers, "If he confesses that he has erred, why does he continue a Bishop? Let him depose himself from the Priesthood, and I will grant Pardon to the Penitent." "I will answer you in your own words, says St. *Jerom*, If a Layman confesses that he has erred, why does he continue a Laick? Let him depose himself from the Priesthood of a Layman, that is, his Baptism, and I will grant Pardon to the Penitent. For it is written, *He hath made us a Kingdom and Priests unto his Father.* And again, *An holy Nation, a Royal Priesthood, a chosen People.* All that is lawful for a Christian, is common as well to a Bishop as a Layman. He that does Penance condemns his former Acts. If it be not lawful for a Penitent Bishop to remain what he was, it is not lawful



“lawful for a Penitent Layman to remain in  
 “that state for which he does Penance. ----- We  
 “do not act inconsistently with ourselves: either  
 “we receive the Bishop with his People, whom  
 “he has made Christians: or if we receive not  
 “the Bishop, we know that we ought also to  
 “reject the People.”

Upon this the Doctor asks this Question:  
 “Do not those therefore, according to St. Je-  
 “rom’s Principle, and the Sense and Practice of  
 “the Catholick Church in his Time, act incon-  
 “sistently with themselves, who are for Recei-  
 “ving the Dissenting Laymen as Lay-Christi-  
 “ans, and their Teachers also in the Station of  
 “Laymen; but will not receive those who  
 “they suppose make them Christians by Bap-  
 “tism, as Clergymen? The Catholick Church,  
 “as he observes, did not receive any upon Re-  
 “pentance without Baptism, except they came  
 “over from a Sect whose Clergy were also re-  
 “ceived as Clergymen.”

If the Doctor had truly understood the Disci-  
 pline of the Primitive Church, he never would  
 have asked such a Question as this. And he  
 might have spared his Reflexion, if for no other  
 Reason, yet for the sake of his Mother the  
 Church of *England*, whose known and avowed  
 Practice, and not meerly that of any Private  
 Men, it manifestly reflects upon. But it is not  
 a greater Reflexion on the Church of *England*,  
 than it is on the Practice of the whole Catholick  
 Primitive Church, which in Receiving those  
 who were Baptized by Hereticks and Schisma-  
 ticks, very often received those as Laymen,  
 whose Teachers and Baptizers she would not  
 receive as Clergymen, but only in the Station  
 of Laymen, as I intend to give the Doctor full  
 Proof



Proof from another sort of Authorities than what he here insists upon. So that whatever pretended Inconsistency there is in the thing, the Charge lights as heavy upon the whole Primitive Church, as it does upon any others. And yet, after all, if I have any understanding of this difficult Passage of St. *Jerom*, (for I will not pretend here to be exact Master of it) there is no Ground to make such a Reflexion from his Argumentation. For St. *Jerom* seems here to me not to speak Absolutely and Dogmatically either his own Sense always, or the Sense of the Church, but to be arguing Hypothetically, and as we now say, *ad hominem*, with his Adversaries, upon their own Principles and Practice. 'Tis plain enough he does so in some Expressions, as where he says, "If a Layman confesses that he has erred, why does he continue a Laick? let him depose himself from the Priesthood of a Layman, that is, his Baptism, and I will grant Pardon to the Penitent." This was not according to the Principles or Practice of the Church: For she never deposed Laymen from their Baptism, if once truly Baptized by Hereticks; nor does St. *Jerom* plead for it, but only shews his Adversaries what they ought to do according to their own Principles, who asserted, That all Hereticks were meer Heathens, and therefore, according to their Principles, Laymen ought to be deposed from their Priesthood, that is, their Baptism, as well as Clergymen from their Priesthood; because if Hereticks were meer Heathens, they could have no Pretence to Christian Baptism. And therefore there was as much Reason to allow the Church her Liberty to receive Clergymen to their Priesthood, if she thought fit to do it, as the *Luciferians* took in



receiving Laymen to their Priesthood, which was their Baptism, even when their Principles led them to Depose them. Therefore he charges the *Luciferians* as acting inconsistently with themselves, and against their own Principles, whilst the Church acted consistently to her own Principles, which was to use her Liberty in receiving Clergymen to their Orders, if she thought it requisite in her own Wisdom and Discretion. Not that the Church was bound to do this in all Cases, or else reject the People with the Priests; as the Doctor pleads: Neither of which he will ever be able to prove to have been the Practice of the Church, either from St. *Ferom* or any other Author. For, as I said before, it appears evidently in Fact, that she often received Laymen, without obliging them to receive a new Baptism, at the same time that she rejected the Priests that had given them Baptism, from their Pretended Priesthood. So that it seems pretty plain to me, that St. *Ferom* is here only arguing Hypothetically with his Adversaries; and if the Doctor would have used this Key, he might more happily have unlocked the dark Sense and Meaning of his Author, and spared his unnecessary Reflexions.

But the Doctor goes on again with St. *Ferom*, p. 69. "Wherefore I beseech you, says he, that you either allow him a Right to offer Sacrifice whose Baptisms you approve, or reject his Baptism, whom you esteem to be no Priest." Again, says he, "I do not at present either blame the *Arians* or defend them: I keep to my Point. A Bishop is received by us for the same Reason for which a Layman is received." Here the Doctor, by a little Art, drops two Words at the end of the Sentence, which should have



have been put in, to make the Reader understand the Drift of his Author. It should have been, Received by you, meaning the *Luciferians*. For St. *Ferom*'s Words are, *Recipitur à vobis*; whereas, as the Doctor has cited them, any one would believe that St. *Ferom* had said, that a Bishop was received by the Church for the same Reason for which a Layman was received by her; when indeed St. *Ferom* says quite otherwise, "A Bishop is received by us (Catholicks) upon the same Foot as a Layman is received by you (*Luciferians*)." *Eâdem ratione à nobis Episcopum recipi, qua Laicus à vobis recipitur*. Which makes a wide Difference in the matter, as I shall shew the Doctor by and by.

But he goes on still with St. *Ferom*: "Therefore according to the Custom of Boys disputing together, says he, what you shall say, I will say; what you shall affirm, I will affirm; what you shall deny, I will deny. An *Arian* baptizes, therefore he is a Bishop: He does not baptize; do you deny him to be a Lay-Christian, and I do not receive him for a Priest. I will follow you whithersoever you go: We will both stick in the Mire or both get out of it." Here the Words, *Tu refuta Laicum, & ego non recipio sacerdotem*, should be rendered otherwise, "Do you refuse to receive the Layman, and then I will not receive the Priest."

A little after the *Luciferian* argues thus: "A Layman, tho' baptized out of the Faith of the Church (so the Doctor reads it, *Extra Ecclesiæ Fidem baptizatus*, which, in my Books of the Colen Edition, 1616. is, *Extra Ecclesiam Fide baptizatus*, baptized in the Faith, tho' out of the Church) "is received as a Penitent."



"nitent. But a Bishop shall not do Penance,  
 "because he is a Priest: Or if he should do Pe-  
 "nance, he ceases to be a Bishop. Therefore  
 "we rightly receive a Layman to Penance,  
 "and reject a Bishop if he will continue in his  
 "Priesthood." St. *Jerom* replies, "Prove to  
 "me, that a Layman, coming over from the  
 "Arians, has Baptism, and I will not refuse to  
 "admit him to Penance. But, if he is no  
 "Christian, if he had not a Priest who could  
 "make him a Christian, how shall a Man do  
 "Penance, who does not yet believe?" The  
 "*Luciferian* answers, "Do you think it just, that  
 "an *Arian* should be a Bishop?" "You prove  
 "him to be a Bishop, says St. *Jerom*, because  
 "you receive him whom he has baptized. In  
 "this you are to be blamed, that you separate  
 "from us, and yet agree with us both in the  
 "Faith, and in the Reception of the *Arians*.---  
 "We receive a Bishop from the *Arians* for the  
 "same Reason for which you receive one bap-  
 "tized by them. We agree in Faith, we agree  
 "in receiving Hereticks, let us agree in Com-  
 "munion." The *Luciferian* replies, "Behold I  
 "lift up my Hands: I yield you have conquer-  
 "ed me."

These are the Doctors long Citations out of  
 St. *Jerom*, instead of which, one short plain  
 Proposition, asserting, the Necessity of Rebap-  
 tizing all that were Baptized by Laymen, in Or-  
 dinary Cases, as I had produced one for the  
 Lawfulness of Laymen's Baptizing in Extraordi-  
 nary Cases, had been much more to his Purpose.  
 But he pretends not to find any such, or so  
 much as point it out to his Reader; but only  
 makes these two General Observations upon the  
 whole. 1. "That I was to blame for saying,

"St.



“ St. *Ferom* was silent in this Matter. 2. That  
 “ St. *Ferom* has plainly enough shewn what was  
 “ the Sense of the Catholick Church in this  
 “ Point. And whatsoever might be his Opinion  
 “ of Lay-Baptism in Cases of Necessity, it is  
 “ certain he was of Opinion, and the Church  
 “ with him, that Lay-Baptism, in Ordinary  
 “ Cases, was wholly Null and Void, and that  
 “ Persons so pretendedly Baptized were not to  
 “ be received into the Church as Penitent Chri-  
 “ stians, but as *Gentiles* by Baptism. For it is  
 “ evident from him, that if they were not bap-  
 “ tized with Episcopal Baptism, they received  
 “ no Baptism at all.”

As to his first Observation, I think, with sub-  
 mission, I was so far from being to blame for  
 saying St. *Ferom* was silent upon the Matter,  
 that I should rather have been to blame if I had  
 said otherwise, unless I could have proved it  
 more Directly, Plainly, and Closely than the  
 Doctor has done. It is an easy matter to make  
 a Flourish with dark Reasonings and ambiguous  
 Words, as many Men have done with the Intri-  
 cate Part of this Dialogue of St. *Ferom*; and it  
 is not a very easy Matter to make an Ordinary  
 Reader understand him, tho' I tell him he speaks  
 not his own Sense many times, but only Hypo-  
 thetically, to his Adversaries. Yet I hope the  
 Doctor understands what I mean. Some of the  
 most plausible Words the Doctor has urged are  
 these, *Reprobes ejus baptismum quem non existimas sa-*  
*cerdotem*, Reject his Baptism whom you esteem  
 to be no Priest. But it seems very probable to  
 me, that St. *Ferom* here is not delivering Dog-  
 matically his own Opinion, much less the Sense  
 and Practice of the Church, but only shewing  
 the Adversaries what they ought to do upon  
 their



their own Principles. As any one that reads the whole Passage will easily perceive. The *Luciferian* had laboured in a long Discourse to prove, that the *Arian* Bishops ought not to be admitted as Bishops in the Church, because they were the Disciples of Antichrist, the Enemies of CHRIST, Blind Guides, Salt without Savour, Idolaters, Sacrilegious, and abundance more. And he also concluded, "That the Church, by admitting them, had as it were, by a little Leaven, d corrupted her whole Mass, whilst to Day she received the Eucharist at the Hands of him, whom the Day before she rejected as an Idolater." To this *St. Jerom* replies, "Admit that what you say be true, let an *Arian* Bishop be the Enemy of CHRIST, let him be Insipid Salt, a Lamp without Fire, an Eye without Sight: All that you can gain by this is, That he who has no Salt himself, cannot season others, that a blind Man cannot illuminate others, nor he make others shine, whose own Light is extinct and his Lamp gone out. But why then do you complain of the

d *Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucif. cap. 2.* Ex quibus ostenditur, dicit *Luciferianus*, vos per modicum fermentum totam Ecclesiae Massam corrupisse, & de ejus manu hodie Eucharistiam accipere, quem heri quasi Idololatram respuebatis. *Resp. Orthodoxus.* Sit quippe, ut vis, *Arianorum* Episcopus hostis Christi, sit infatuatum sal, sit lucerna sine igniculo, sit oculus sine pupillâ: Nempe eo pervenies, ut salire non possit, qui sal ipse non habeat, non illuminet cæcus, non accendat extinctus. Tu autem, cum conditum ab eo cibum devores, cur insulsum arguis Conditorem? De igniculo ejus Ecclesia tua lucet, & lucernam ejus criminariis extinctam? Oculos tibi præbet, & cæcus est? Quamobrem oro te, ut aut sacrificandi ei licentiam tribuas, cujus baptisma probas; aut reprobes ejus baptisma, quem non existimas sacerdotem. Neque enim fieri potest, ut qui in baptismo sanctus est, sit apud altare peccator.



“ Insipid Seasoner, while you eat of the Meat  
“ which he has Seasoned? Your Church shines  
“ by the Light of his Fire, and do you still com-  
“ plain that his Lamp is gone out? He gives  
“ Eyes to you, and is he himself Blind? Where-  
“ fore I beseech you, either allow him the Li-  
“ berty of Offering at the Altar, whose Bap-  
“ tism you approve; or else refuse his Baptism,  
“ whom you do not esteem to be a Priest. For  
“ it cannot be, that he who is Holy in the Mi-  
“ nistration of Baptism, can be a Sinner at the  
“ Altar.”

Who sees not now, that the plain Drift and Design of St. *Jerom* was to argue with and confute the *Luciferians*, upon their own Principles; by shewing them, that if an *Arian* Bishop was qualified to minister true Baptism (which they themselves supposed, for they received his Baptism without repeating it) then he was as well qualified to be a Priest, which he explains by Offering Sacrifice at the Altar: If he was qualified to Baptize, he was qualified to offer Sacrifice at the Altar. And therefore, upon their Principles, they were obliged either to refuse the Baptism of an *Arian* Bishop (which yet they accepted,) or else to allow him liberty of sacrificing at the Altar, which they utterly refused. Whatever St. *Jerom*'s Notions might be in themselves, here is nothing in all this that clearly discovers them to us: For his Discourse is all Hypothetical, and only Argument, *ad hominem*, upon the Principles and avowed Practices of his Adversaries. He does not say, That none but a Priest that could offer Sacrifice at the Altar, (which is the Notion of a Priest here spoken of) could Baptize: For then neither Deacons in Ordinary Cases, nor Laymen in Extraordinary Cases,



Cases of Necessity could have done it ; for neither of these is allowed to offer Sacrifice at the Altar ; and yet St. *Jerom* allows them both to minister Baptism Authoritatively in those respective Cases : But his Intention was only to shew his Adversaries, that if they allowed an *Arian* Bishop to Baptize, they ought also to allow him to offer Sacrifice at the Altar, since a Bishop or Priest cannot be debarred of one of these Offices and allowed the other : Either he has a Right to both, or a Right to neither ; he cannot be Holy and a Priest at the Font in Baptism, and at the same time Unholy and no Priest at the Altar. This was Rational Discourse to a *Luciferian*, upon his own Hypothesis, when the Question was concerning an *Arian* Bishop, Whether he had not as much Right to Sacrifice as to Baptize ? He that allowed the one to a Bishop, ought in Reason to allow the other, or else, by Parity of Reason, equally to deny him both. But here is nothing positively asserted, but all upon Supposition. He does not here either absolutely vindicate or condemn the *Arian* Baptism ; he does not say, an *Arian* Bishop has a Right to Sacrifice at the Altar, but only upon Supposition that he had a Right to Baptize, then he could not be denied to have a Right to Sacrifice also. So that here is nothing absolutely and positively determined by St. *Jerom*, concerning the absolute necessity of a Priest, in all Cases, to minister Baptism ; unless we distinguish the Priesthood, as St. *Jerom* does elsewhere, into the *Sacerdotium Clerici*, & *Sacerdotium Laici*, the Priesthood of a Clergyman, and the Priesthood of a Layman, which is, the Christian's Baptism : In which latter and large Notion it is necessary every Man should be a Priest, that is, a Baptized Christian



Christian, that ministers Christian Baptism: For tho' the *Luciferian* was forced to maintain it upon his absurd Principles, yet St. *Jerom* and all the Ancients utterly deny, that a Man that was a meer Heathen could give Christian Baptism: But I do not think, that St. *Jerom* here, in this place, intended to determine who was the Minister of Baptism, but only to infer from the Principle and Concession of the *Luciferians*, That if an *Arian* Bishop had Power to Baptize, then he had Power to offer Sacrifice at the Altar also: And so the Church was vindicated in receiving *Arian* Bishops again into Office, even upon the Principle of the *Luciferians*. He does not here determine, Whether the *Arians* were true Bishops and Priests or not; tho' he does elsewhere in the Negative: Nor whether the Church, in strictness of Discipline, was obliged to receive them to the Episcopal Honour again; which in other places he also plainly denies: But he only vindicates the Churches prudential Liberty in receiving them, from the Practice of the *Luciferians*, who, by the same Reason that they allowed them to Baptize, ought to allow them to sacrifice at the Altar also.

I have been the longer in explaining this short Passage of St. *Jerom*, because the right Explication of it will help as a Key to open the Labyrinth of all the rest of his dark and intricate Reasonings, which Dr. *Brett* has chosen to be the Groundwork of his Demonstration. This shews his Meaning, when he says, "I do not at present either Blame the *Arians* or Defend them: I keep to my Point: A Bishop is received by us upon the same Reason as a Layman is received by you. What you shall affirm, I will affirm; what you shall deny, I will



“ will deny. An *Arian* baptizes, therefore he  
“ is a Bishop: He does not Baptize; Do you  
“ refuse to receive the Layman, and I will not  
“ receive the Bishop.” Is not this the Point he  
still keeps to, to follow the *Luciferians* and argue  
with them upon their own Principles? Here is  
nothing of St. *Jerom's* positive Sense, or the  
Churches in all this, but only to catch the Ad-  
versaries in all their Windings and Turnings,  
upon their own Hypothesis. Otherwise St. *Je-*  
*rom* would speak Contradictions, that an *Arian*  
was a Bishop, and not a Bishop; that he could  
Baptize, and not Baptize; that the Church did  
both receive him, and not receive him.

So again, when he says, “ Prove to me that  
“ a Layman coming over from the *Arians* has  
“ Baptism, and I will not refuse to admit him  
“ to Penance. But if he is not a Christian, if  
“ he had not a Priest to make him a Christian,  
“ how shall a Man do Penance, who does not  
“ yet believe?” St. *Jerom* does not here deny  
absolutely, that an *Arian's* Baptism might be re-  
ceived (for the Church actually received them)  
but only upon the Hypothesis of the *Luciferians*,  
who said all *Arians*, as well their Lay-Priests as  
Clergy-Priests, were meer Heathens, and con-  
sequently there were no Priests of any kind a-  
mong them that could give Christian Baptism:  
For a Man must be a Christian Priest of some  
sort or other, and not a meer Heathen, before  
he is qualified to give Christian Baptism. So  
that his saying, A Man is no Christian, if he  
had not a Priest to make him a Christian, makes  
nothing for the absolute Invalidity of Lay-Bap-  
tism in general, (which St. *Jerom* himself plain-  
ly allows to Lay-Men, or Lay-Priests, as he  
calls them, in Case of Necessity) but only upon  
the



the Hypothesis of the *Luciferians*, who made all *Arians* no Priests, but meer Heathens.

In the last place, when the *Luciferian* demands, "Do you think it just that an *Arian* should be a Bishop?" St. *Ferom* replies, "You prove him to be a Bishop, because you receive him whom he has Baptized." This Answer is still made to the *Luciferian* upon his own Practice. St. *Ferom* does not assert, that every Man that Baptizes is a Bishop; for then a Presbyter and a Deacon would be a Bishop, and a Layman would be a Bishop, because he baptizes in Cases of Necessity: But he only says, If the *Luciferians* allowed an *Arian* Bishop to baptize, their own very Practice proved he might be allowed to exercise any other Episcopal Acts, and they had no reason to quarrel with the Church, as they did, for admitting *Arian* Bishops to officiate in the Church again, when in Prudence she thought it requisite so to do, since they themselves allowed them to exercise one Episcopal Act, *viz.* Baptism, and that was sufficient to justify the Church in receiving them again to officiate at the Altar; since no just Reason could be assign'd, why a Bishop should be allowed to baptize, and not also be admitted (if the Church thought fit) to offer Sacrifice at the Altar.

I believe any reasonable Man will now see the whole Tendency of St. *Ferom*'s Discourse in all these Passages, that it was not to determine the Point of the Invalidity of Lay-baptism, but to justify the Church in her Prudence and Condescension toward the *Arian* Bishops, upon the Principles of the *Luciferians*, as I have explain'd it. And therefore I cannot yet think myself to blame for saying St. *Ferom* was silent in this Matter, however Dr. *Brett* is of a different Opinion.

But



But admit St. *Ferom* had as clearly delivered his Opinion against the Validity of Lay-Baptism in Ordinary Cases, as the Doctor imagines: Yet it does not so certainly follow from hence, as to amount to a Demonstration, that the whole Church must needs be of the same Opinion: For might not St. *Ferom* mistake the Sense and Practice of the Church as well as another Man? Or mistake her in this Point as well as in some others? Might he not mistake the Sense of the Church then, as well as either Dr. *Brett* or I do now mistake the Sense and Practice of the Church of *England*, who deliver contrary Opinions about her, and therefore one of us must needs be mistaken? If St. *Ferom* had never so plainly delivered this as the Sense of the Church, yet if there be greater Evidence from the Church herself, and such Evidence as cannot be contradicted, that it was otherwise; then the Testimony of the Church herself, and not St. *Ferom*, is to be believed in this Case. And that thus it was, I will prove to the Doctor by another sort of Demonstration than that which he pretends to. For I will shew it plainly from the History of the first Six General Councils and many others (which in full Consent with one another are the best Evidence of the Churches Sense and Practice) that she received the Baptism of those whom she accounted Laymen. For all Hereticks and Schismaticks, when once Convicted and Degraded, were no other than Laymen in her Opinion. Which if I shew the Doctor plainly to be true, then I hope he will submit to the Force of the Argument, which carries in it the Evidence of a Demonstration, since it is as good Proof as the Nature of the Subject is capable of: And we shall



shall need no longer Dispute or Cavil about St. *Jerom* or any other Private Author, when the Question is once so fully decided by the Supreme Authority of the Church. This therefore is what I will try with the Doctor, and the Gentlemen of his Opinion, in the following Discourse.

And here for the same Reason I might have omitted what the Doctor says of St. *Chrysostom*, P. 53. who is the only remaining Author the Doctor pretends to urge for his Cause.

S. 7.  
*The Testimony of Chrysostom no Evidence against the Baptism of Laymen in Extraordinary Cases.*

I had said before, that Dr. *Forbes* had utterly mistaken the meaning of St. *Chrysostom*. For when *Chrysostom* confines the Office of Baptism to the Hands of a Priest, he only means in Ordinary Cases; otherwise Deacons who are no Priests, would be absolutely excluded from it in all Cases whatsoever, as well as Laymen: And yet *Chrysostom* allows Deacons to baptize in Cases of Necessity; which makes it evident that his Discourse only relates to the Ministration of Baptism in Ordinary Cases. To which the Doctor replies, That St. *Chrysostom* here by a Priest means only a Bishop. Which, in my Opinion, instead of mending the matter, makes it so much worse. For then, according to Dr. *Forbes*'s Interpretation, no Valid Baptism could be administered but by the Hands of a Bishop. Yes, Dr. *Brett* says, by the Bishop's Authority Presbyters and Deacons may do it. But I conceive there is some difference between the Bishop's Hands and his Authority, and so Dr. *Forbes* thought, who makes this Passage conclude as much against Deacons as Laymen, and that

with



with Reason enough, upon his Supposition, that none but a Priest, with his own Hands actually, can have Authority to baptize in any Case whatsoever. For the Hands of a Deacon were not the Hands of a Priest, either in the Opinion of *Chrysostom* or Dr. *Forbes*, whether we understand by a Priest either the Bishop alone, or a Bishop and Presbyter together. So that this Passage, in the Sense which Dr. *Forbes* put upon it, holds as much against Deacons as Laymen. And Dr. *Brett*, instead of Vindicating Dr. *Forbes*, runs to another thing, and tells us, Deacons may have Authority from the Bishop to baptize, which Dr. *Forbes* utterly denies. So these Gentlemen clash together, and yet neither of them hit the Truth, because they would not rightly understand *Chrysostom* of Ministering Baptism in Ordinary Cases only, which I shewed was all that possibly could be his Meaning.

But Dr. *Brett* says, “*Chrysostom*’s Opinion is plainly so far on their side, as to shew the Invalidity of all Antiepiscopal Baptisms, all Baptisms by such as are Uncommissioned, Unauthorized by a Bishop.” To which I answer, Tho’ all such Baptisms should be allow’d to be Invalid, yet this is more than the Doctor can prove out of this Place of *Chrysostom*, unless meer Silence be a Proof; for *Chrysostom* says nothing here expressly of Commissioned or Uncommissioned, Authorized or Unauthorized, Episcopal or Antiepiscopal Baptism; but only that Baptism cannot be given by any but the Hands of a Priest, which I interpret of the Ordinary Ministration by a Bishop or a Presbyter; but Dr. *Forbes* extends it to all Cases, not only Ordinary but Extraordinary, and thereby excludes Deacons from the Power of Baptizing,  
as



as well as Laymen; Dr. *Brett* confines the Office of Baptism to the hands of a Bishop, but says he may Commission a Presbyter or a Deacon, yet not a Layman; which is only telling a Man's own Sense without his Author, for *Chrysostom's* Words make no such Distinctions here, and the Doctor should have proved his Sense of this Place (as I did) from others in the same Author, if he had intended to satisfy a judicious Reader.

But the Doctor goes a little farther, and says, *Chrysostom* does not give his own Private Opinion, but the known Judgment and Practice of the Church. Yet the Reader must take this upon his Word too, for he offers no manner of Proof of it, but only by saying, the Church had confined this Charge to the Episcopal Office, and that, he thinks, Invalidated all such Baptisms as had not the Bishop's Commission. Now this is the thing to be tryed between the Doctor and me, Whether all Unauthorized and Uncommissioned Baptism, that was administered by Persons that were no Actual Priests, but Laymen, was declared wholly Invalid, Null and Void, and as such ordered to be repeated by the Church. The Doctor affirms it upon the Testimony of St. *Cyprian*, St. *Basil*, St. *Jerom*, and St. *Chrysostom*, which I have now examined; and I deny it upon the strongest Evidence of all the General and Particular Councils of the Church, whose Decrees and Orders must be owned to be the most convincing Proof of the Churches Sense and Practice. From which I shall shew, that the Church received the Baptism of some Hereticks and Schismaticks, who never had any true Orders from any Episcopal Ordination; and the Baptism of others, whom  
E she



she herself Degraded, and took their Orders from them, leaving them altogether in an Unauthorized State, and divested of all Sacerdotal Power; not having so much as the Name, much less the Dignity and Authority of Priests, but entirely reduced to the State and Quality of Laymen. If I can prove these things to my Friend in a way of the plainest Demonstration to his Satisfaction, I hope I shall have no farther Dispute with him, whatever I may have with others, upon this Subject, because I know him to be an Ingenuous Man, and he has promised to yield the Cause upon fair and rational Conviction. And here I will do him that Justice to say, He has managed the Dispute with as much Strength and Learning as the Cause would bear, and with as much Good Manners and Christian Temper as any Disputant in the present Age; for which he is truly to be commended, and will not fail thereby to advance his Reputation with those, who cannot otherwise fall in with his Mistaken Notions, which happen to run so cross to the General Sense and Practice of the Catholick Church.

A Scho-



A  
Scholastical History  
OF  
Lay-Baptism.

PART II.

CHAP. I.

*That Hereticks, and Schismaticks, and Degraded Clerks, and Excommunicated Clerks, when once they are Convicted, and legally Censured, are no longer Authorized to minister Baptism, or officiate as true Priests and Ministers of GOD and the Church; but that thenceforth all their Acts are Unauthorized, and done only by Usurpation.*

*This proved from the History of the first Six General Councils, and their Proceedings against Hereticks and Schismaticks, and other Delinquents.*

**T**HE first General Council was the famous Council of Nice, which all Men reverence, and which alone

§. 1.  
*How Meletius was Deposed and Divested of all Ministerial Authority, by the Council of Nice.*



were sufficient to put an end to this whole Dispute. This Council was called by *Constantine* in the Year 325, to allay the Flames that had sometime before been raised by *Meletius* and *Arius* in the Church. *Meletius* was Bishop of *Lycopolis* in *Egypt*, who had for a long time headed a Schism of his own making, against the Bishops of *Alexandria*, his lawful Metropolitans. The occasion of his Schism was this: *Meletius*, in the time of the *Diocletian* Persecution, had denied the Faith and offered Sacrifice to Idols; for which, and some other Reasons, he was, according to the Laws of the Church, deposed by a *Peter* Bishop of *Alexandria*, who presently after suffered Martyrdom. *Meletius*, instead of submitting to this Legal Censure, raised a Schism upon it, first against *Peter*, then against *Achillas* and *Alexander* his Successors; ordaining Bishops and Priests throughout *Egypt* and *Thebais*, to strengthen his Faction; and this he continued to do to the time of the Council of *Nice*. The Council therefore, to correct this Presumption, and confirm the Sentence which before had been passed upon him, made this peremptory Decree against him, which is in their Synodical Epistle sent to the Churches of *Alexandria*, *Egypt*, *Libya*, and *Pentapolis*, and recorded by *Socrates*<sup>b</sup> and *Theodoret*, "That *Meletius* should have no manner of Power or Authority, either of Ordaining or Making Elections; that he should be confined to his own City, and neither appear in the Country,

<sup>a</sup> Socrat. Hist. Lib. 1. c. 6. Καθ' ἑσθλὴν, &c: Athanas. Apol. 2. p. 777.

<sup>b</sup> Socrat. Lib. 1. c. 9. Theodor. Lib. 1. c. 9. Μὴ δύνανται ἔτι καὶ ἐκείνους μὴτε ἀποδοῦναι μὴτε δεχθῆναι.



Country, nor in any other City upon such an Occasion, but only retain the bare Name and Title of his Dignity. And for such Bishops and Presbyters as had been Ordained by him, they should not be admitted to officiate as Ministers in the Catholick Church, till they were *Μυστη-  
τήρα χειροτονία βεβαιωθέντες*, Confirmed or Authorized by a more Sacred Imposition of Hands, together with the Approbation and Allowance of the Bishop of *Alexandria*. Which *Valesius*, and *Du Pin*, and other Learned Men, take to imply a new Ordination: However, it certainly implies a new Authority and Confirmation from the Church, and supposes that all their pretended Ministerial Offices before were done without competent and just Authority, and only by meer Usurpation: And if they continued to act as they had done before, all their Ministerial Acts would be Unauthorized, especially after such a Formal and Judicial Degradation by the greatest Power of the Church in a General Council. This, I think, is as clear as the Sun at Noon-day, That either the Council of *Nice* had no Authority from God, by the Power of the Keys, to deprive *Meletius* of his Authority, for his Contumacy and just Deserts; or else that *Meletius* had no Authority, after this, to act as a Bishop of the Church; nor any of his Accomplices, who only derived from him, any Authority to perform any Ministerial Offices, till they had first received a more competent Authority from the Catholick Church. And yet the Council made no Decree that the Baptisms of all these should be annulled, and that such as came over from them should be Rebaptized again; as she did in the Case of the *Paulianists*, in her 19<sup>th</sup> Canon: because tho' the *Meletians*



and *Paulianists* were equally divested of the Churches true Authority to minister Baptism or any other Sacred Office, yet the one Baptized in the Form of the Church, and the other did not, which was the Reason of this Distinction. And it plainly shews the Sense of the *Nicene* Fathers, that they did not think a Baptism that was given in due Form, was necessarily to be repeated, because given by a Person who had no competent Authority to give it: For then they would have ordered the *Meletians* to have been Rebaptized, as well as the *Paulianists*; which yet neither they nor any other Council have done; nor is there to be found any Instance of such a *Meletian's* Rebaptization, that I know of, in all ancient History.

After this Decree *Meletius*, as soon as he came back to *Lycopolis*, went on in his own way, in Contempt of the Council, ordaining Bishops to propagate his Schism, as he had done before. For as *Baronius* observes out of *Athanasius*<sup>c</sup>, he made *Arsenius* Bishop of *Hypsele* in *Thebais*, and *Sozomen*<sup>d</sup> adds, that a little before his Death he Ordained one *John* to be his Successor at *Lycopolis*. Now will any one say, that *Meletius* had Authority to Ordain these Men, when the Council had taken all Power and Authority from him? If not, then *Meletius* was no true Priest or Minister of God and his Church, but all his Acts were Unauthorized, and done only by Usurpation.

The

<sup>c</sup> Athanas. Apol. 2. Baron. an. 326. n. 7.

<sup>d</sup> Sozomen. Lib. 2. c. 21.



The same Council shewed her Authority a little farther in the Condemnation of *Arius*, and those Bishops that joined with him in his Herefy: For they not only Deposed them, but Anathematized them also. *Arius* himself had been once or twice Deposed before by *Alexander*, his Bishop, and declared Excommunicate or Anathematized in a full Synod of *Egyptian* Bishops. *Socrates*<sup>e</sup> says, *Alexander* called a Synod of many Bishops, where *Arius*, and those that embraced his Opinions were Deposed: And *Alexander* wrote a Synodical or Encyclical Epistle, to give notice to all other Churches. This Epistle is recorded by *Socrates*, wherein it is said, That they were cast out of the Church, and Anathematized, and declared to be Aliens both from the Church and the Catholick Faith. And *Alexander* says, He therefore intimated the Fact to other Churches, that they might do as became Christians, that is, shew their Averfation to all such as spake against CHRIST, or held ill Opinions of him, as Men that were Enemies to GOD, and Destroyers of Mens Souls; and that they might not bid them, GOD Speed, and so become Partakers in their Sins, as St. *John* words it. *Epiphanius*<sup>f</sup> takes notice of the same, and says, *Alexander* expelled *Arius* from the Church, and published his Excommunication throughout the whole City. And the curious Diligence of *Cotelerius* has helped us to the very Form of his Deposition, under the Name of *Καταίρεσις Ἀρείου*,

§. 2.

*How Arius was Deposed and Anathematized by the same Council.*

E 4

The

<sup>e</sup> Socrat. Lib. 1. c. 6.

<sup>f</sup> Epiphan. Hæres. 69. n. 3. Ἐξέοι αὐτὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας  
καὶ ἐκκληρυκτὸν ποιεῖ ἐν τῇ πόλει.



The Deposition of *Arius*, which the Inquisitive Reader may find at large in *Cotelerius's* Notes <sup>g</sup> upon the Constitutions. Now what *Alexander* and the *Egyptian* Synods had done before, the Great Council of *Nice* Confirmed and Ratified, declaring *Arius*, and two Bishops, *Secundus* and *Theonas*, to be Deposed <sup>h</sup> for joining with him: And they also Anathematized, or laid the greater Excommunication upon him, and all others that should maintain the same Errors; adding these Words at the end of their Creed <sup>i</sup>, *Those that say, There was a time when the Son of GOD was not, or that he had no Being before he was Created, or that he was made out of Nothing, or of any other Substance, or Created, or Changeable, the Catholick and Apostolick Church Anathematizes them.*

Now by the Tenour of these direful Censures, *Arius* and all his Adherents were not only Deposed from their Clerical Office and Orders, but also expelled from Lay-Communion, and all the Privileges of Christians, save only that their Baptism intitled them to be admitted again into the Church upon a true Repentance. But in the mean time, they were neither Authorized Priests, nor compleat Lay-Christians, whilst they were under such Bonds of Excommunication. For no Man is a compleat Layman, who is not in full Communion with the Church. Upon this account Catechumens, who are Unbaptized, and Hereticks and Schismaticks, and Excommunicate Persons, are but imperfect Christians: The first of these Communicate with the Church in the Faith, but not in the Sacraments;

<sup>g</sup> *Coteler. Not. in Constitut. Apost. Lib. 8. c. 28.*

<sup>h</sup> *Conc. Nic. Epist. Synod. ap. Socrat. Lib. 1. c. 9.*

<sup>i</sup> *Ap. Socrat. Lib. 1. c. 8.*



craments; the other three either Excommunicate themselves, or are Excommunicated by the Power of the Keys and Church-Censures. Till therefore they are admitted again and loosed by the same Power of the Keys, they are not in full Communion with the Church, and consequently but imperfect Christians. Now it would be absurd to say, that those who are not so much as Proper and Perfect Lay-Christians, are Proper and Perfect Priests; that they who have no Right to receive themselves the Sacraments, have Authority to give the Sacraments to others. Therefore Hereticks and Schismatics, and Priests under Anathema, can have no Authority to minister the Sacraments whilst they are in that State; or if they do, it is all done without Authority and by Usurpation. And this was the Case of *Arius* and all his Adherents, whilst they were under the Anathema of the Council of *Nice*. The Baptisms which they gave in that State, were given without Authority, and were not so much as the Baptisms of Perfect Lay-Christians. And yet the Church did not Rebaptize such Persons as were Baptized in due Form by them, but only supplied what was Deficient in their Baptism, at their Return to the Church, by Imposition of Hands and Confirmation, as I have fully proved in the First Part of this History, which no one has pretended to call in Question. This then, I think, is Demonstration, that if the Council of *Nice* took away all Clerical Authority from the *Meletians* and *Arians*; and left the one in a State of Laymen, and the other not so much as Laymen; and yet received the Baptisms that were given by both these without Rebaptizing; they must receive the Baptisms of those, who, in



in her Opinion, had no Authority to give Baptism, because she herself had taken that Authority from them. This one thing were enough to silence all Disputes, if Men will hearken to Reason, or the Authority of the Church in so great a Council. But let us see whether the Council of Nice was singular in this Treatment of the *Arians* and *Meletians*, or whether the Church did not always follow her Example in her Behaviour toward Hereticks in succeeding Ages.

## §. 3.

*How the Macedonians, Apollinarians, and other Hereticks, were Degraded and Anathematized in the Second General Council of Constantinople.*

The next General Council was that at *Constantinople*, An. 381. called by *Theodosius* the Great, where 150 Oriental Bishops met to condemn and exterminate two growing Heresies; that of the *Apollinarians*, who denied the Humanity of our Saviour, in denying the Existence of his Humane Soul; and the other of the *Macedonians*, who denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. *Apollinaris* and his Disciple *Timotheus*, had some time before been Condemned and Degraded, in two famous Councils of the *East* and *West*, the one at *Rome* of Ninety-three Bishops, under Pope *Damasus*, An. 373, or 378. And the other at *Antioch* of One-hundred-forty-six Bishops, Anno 378, or 380. The Council at *Rome* both Deposed and Anathematized them, <sup>k</sup> as the Acts of the

---

<sup>k</sup> *Conc. Rom. Profess. Fidei. Conc. Tom. 2. p. 900.* Anathematizamus Macedonianos, qui de Arij Stirpe venientes, non perfidiam mutaverunt, sed nomen. Anathematizamus eos, qui pro hominis animâ rationali & intelligibili, dicunt Dei Verbum in humanâ carne versatum, &c.



the Council and Pope *Damasus's* <sup>l</sup> Synodical Epistle shew: "We Anathematize those (says the Council) who say, that the Word of God was instead of the Rational and Intelligent Soul in the Humane Flesh of CHRIST." And (says *Damasus*) we have Deposed *Timotheus* the prophane Scholar of *Apollinarius*, together with his Impious Doctrine." And so *Theodoret* understood the Censure <sup>m</sup> of the Council to be both Deposition and Excommunication. This Sentence was first confirmed in the Council of *Antioch*, and then in the General Council of *Constantinople*, in whose Synodical Epistle, recorded by *Theodoret*, <sup>n</sup> it is said, That they had published a Writing against the new Sects, the *Eunomians*, the *Arians*, the *Macedonians*, and the *Apollinarians*, laying them all under the Sentence of *Anathema*. And one of the Canons of that Council also confirms all that *Damasus* and the Council of *Antioch* had before decreed against the *Macedonians*, in these words, "We approve the Tome of the Western Bishops <sup>o</sup>, and those of *Antioch*, professing that there is but one Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. As therefore the Western Bishops, and those of *Antioch* had Anathematized the *Macedonians*, so here the Council of *Constantinople* gave their Approbation of the Sentence. And in another Canon

<sup>l</sup> *Damas. Ep. Synod. ap. Theod. Lib. 5. c. 10.* Τιμόθεον τὸν βέβηλον πὺν μαθητὴν τοῦ Ἀπολιναρίου τοῦ αἱρετικῆς καθεύλομεν &c.

<sup>m</sup> *Theod. Lib. 5. c. 9.* Καθελὼν ἀπεκήρυξε, &c.

<sup>n</sup> *Theod. Lib. 5. c. 9.*

<sup>o</sup> *Conc. Constant. can. 5.* Περὶ τοῦ τόμου τῶν Δυτικῶν, καὶ τοῦ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἀπεδεξάμεθα τοῦ μίαν ὁμολογούντος τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ υἱὸς καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦματος θεότητα.



Canon p they depose *Maximus* the Cynick (who had intruded himself into the Place of *Gregory Nazianzen* at *Constantinople*, by the help of Seven Bishops that ordained him) declaring, That *Maximus* neither ever was a Bishop, nor should be a Bishop, nor any of those true Clerks that were Ordained by him in any Degree whatsoever; all that had been done either to him, or by him, being actually void and null. There were two Reasons for Deposing this Man; one was, That he had intruded himself into a full See, which, as I shall shew hereafter, always by the ancient Canons made an Ordination void. Another Reason was, That he was an *Apollinarian* Heretick, which is the Reason that *Theodoret* assigns q why the Council deposed him. Now then the Question will be, Whether any of these Men, *Maximus* or his Clergy, or the rest of the *Macedonian* and *Apollinarian* Hereticks, had any Authority to minister Baptism, after they were legally Deposed by this General Council? To say they had Authority still, notwithstanding their Deposition, is only to affront the Authority of the Council, and make a Jest of all Ecclesiastical Censures. But if they had no Authority to minister Baptism, Whether or no might the Baptisms given by them, without Authority, be received by the Church, supplying only what was Deficient, without Rebaptization? We need not go far for the Resolution of

p Conc. Constant. can. 4. Περὶ Μαξίμου τοῦ κυνικοῦ, καὶ τῆς κατ' αὐτὸν ἀταξίας τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινὺ πόλει γενομένης, ὥστε μήτε Μαξιμον ἐπίσκοπον ἢ γενέσθαι ἢ εἶναι, μήτε τοὺς παρ' αὐτοῦ χειροτονηθέντας ἐν οὐνοδότη καθεδρῷ κληρὸς, πάντων καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν καὶ ὅσων παρ' αὐτοῦ γενομένων ἀκυρωθέντων.

q Theod. Lib. 5. c. 8.



of this Question, for this very Council has fully determined it in her Seventh Canon, if we allow that to belong to this Council: For there the *Macedonians* and *Apollinarians* are expressly named among other Hereticks, whose Baptism might be received by the Sacred Unction without Rebaptizing. Or if any one questions the Authority of that Canon, as Bishop *Beveridge* does, yet the thing is evident from other Proofs: For the Council of *Trullo* has the same Canon<sup>r</sup>; and it does not appear that either the *Macedonians* or *Apollinarians* rejected the true Form of Baptism, but always baptized in the Name of the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*. And it is observable, that this very Council, which annulled the Ordination of *Maximus*, and all that were ordained by him, does not annul the Baptisms given by them, or order them to be repeated: Which shews, that a Difference was made between these things in the Discipline and Practice of the Church.

The third General Council §. 4.  
was held at *Ephesus*, under *Theodosius, Junior*, An. 431. by 200. Bishops, and upwards, *Cyril* of *Alexandria* Presiding over them. This Council is famous for the Deposition of *Nestorius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, and *John* Bishop of *Antioch*, and many others with them. And the Forms of their Depositions, both in the Acts and Canons of that Council, run in such a strain, as shew that they had a just Sense of their own Authority to Degrade Men for Heresy or any other great

*How the third General Council of Ephesus Degraded Nestorius and his Followers.*



great Crimes, and that Men so Legally Degraded had thenceforth no Authority to perform any Ministerial Acts, unless the same Power which laid them under Bonds, thought fit to grant them a Legal Relaxation. The Sentence of Deposition against *Nestorius* runs expressly in this Form: "Our Lord JESUS CHRIST<sup>s</sup> whom  
 " he hath blasphemed, doth, by this Holy Synod,  
 " declare *Nestorius* deprived of Episcopal Dig-  
 " nity, and all Communion and Society of the  
 " Priesthood." Can any thing be more Authentick or Formal than this Proceeding in the Name of CHRIST? And were it reasonable to think the Council esteemed *Nestorius* a Priest after such a judicial Sentence as this? But they not only Deposed *Nestorius*, but all his Abettors and Defenders, particularly *Charisius*, who made an Exposition upon the Creed, to wire draw it to the Sense of *Nestorius*. Against which they made that famous Decree concerning new Forms of Faith: "That no one should Offer, Write, or  
 " Compose any other Creed for the use of New  
 " Converts, beside that which was made in the  
 " Nicene Council: And if any transgressed this  
 " Order, being Bishops, they declare them  
 " Degraded from their Episcopal Order, and  
 " other Clerks from their Clerical Order, and  
 " Laymen to be Anathematized. In like man-  
 " ner;

s Conc. Ephes. Act. 1. Conc. Tom. 3. p. 534. Ὁ βλασφημηθεὶς παρ' αὐτῆς κύνειθ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὡραιοε διὰ πῆς παρέσης ἀγιωτάτης συνόδου, ἀλλότριον ἔχον τὸν αὐτὸν Νεστωριανὸν ὡς ἐπισκοπικῆς ἀξιωματῆρος, καὶ παντὸς συλλόγου ἱερατικῆς.

t Conc. Ephes. Act. 6. p. 690. Τέττες, εἰ μὲν εἶεν ἐπίσκοποι ἢ κληρικοὶ, ἀλλοτεῖας ἔχον τὰς ἐπισκοπικὰς ἐπισκοπίας, καὶ τὰς κληρικὰς τῶς πλήρης.



“ner, if any Bishops<sup>v</sup>, Clerks, or Laymen,  
 “were found to Believe or Teach, concerning  
 “the Incarnation of the Son of God accord-  
 “ing to the Exposition of *Charisius*, or the  
 “wicked and perverse Doctrines of *Nestorius*,  
 “they should be liable to the same Censure of  
 “this holy and œcumenical Synod, viz. That a  
 “Bishop should be removed from his Episcopal  
 “Office, and be Deposed; and a Clerk fall  
 “from his Clerical Degree; and a Layman be  
 “Anathematized, according to the Tenour a-  
 “foresaid.” Now that by Deposing of Here-  
 ticks they meant Depriving them of all Power  
 and Authority of the Priesthood, they them-  
 selves tell us, who are best able to interpret  
 their own Meaning. For in their Synodical  
 Epistle<sup>w</sup> to Pope *Celestin*, where they give him  
 an Account of their Proceedings against *John*  
 Bishop of *Antioch* and his Schismatical Synod,  
 they tell him, They had taken from them all  
 Power of the Priesthood, so that they could  
 now do no one any harm by their Sentence of  
 Excommunication. For it was but necessary  
 and reasonable they should be deprived of the  
 Power of doing Hurt. And in another place  
 they declare this *John* and his Adherents to be  
 cast out of the Church, and to have no Power<sup>x</sup>  
 or Faculty, as from any Authority of the Priest-  
 hood,

<sup>v</sup> Conc. Ephes. Act. 6. p. 690. Τὸν μὲν ἐπίσκοπον ἀλλο-  
 τεῖσθαι τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς καὶ εἶναι καθηρημένον, τὸν δὲ κληρικὸν  
 ὁμοίως ἐκπύθην τῷ κλήρῳ.

<sup>w</sup> Conc. Ephes. Tom. 3. p. 666. Περιελόντες αὐτῶν  
 πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν ἱερατικὴν, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι βλάπτειν, &c.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. Act. 5. p. 654. Μηδεμίαν ἔχοντες ἀδείαν, ὡς εἴ  
 αὐθεντίας ἱερατικῆς, εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι πινᾶς βλάπτειν ἐκ ταύτης  
 ἢ ὠφελεῖν &c.



hood, either to Hurt or Benefit any one thereby, until they should condemn themselves, and confess their Fault. Which if they did not do in a short time, they might be sure the utmost Severity of the Canons would be exercised upon them, that is, they should be irreversibly Degraded without hopes of Restitution. Nothing can be plainer than these Words to take away all Authority of the Priesthood from such Clerks, as were Legally Deposed by the just Power of the Keys in the Church. It took away the whole *ὅλην, ἐξουσίαν, αὐθεντίαν ἱεραρχικήν*, the whole Power, Authority, and Spiritual Efficacy of the Priesthood from them. They might do the Acts of a Priest, Bind or Absolve, but those would be of no Spiritual Efficacy, because done without Authority; their Bindings would hurt no Man, nor their Absolutions benefit him, because the Authentical Power of the Priesthood was wanting in them. They did not then dream of such a Notion of the Indelible Character of the Priesthood, as some have advanced since, as if a Man could Act with the Absolute Authority of a Priest, when GOD and CHRIST and the best Authority in the Church had taken his Authority from him. The very Opponents of this Council had no such Opinion, but only pleaded, They were unjustly Deposed; and therefore to be quits with Cyril and his Council, John of Antioch, and his Faction, took upon them to Depose Cyril and the Council, as *Apollinarians*; and they did it much in the same Form of Words as the other had used toward them: For so *Liberatus*, in giving an Account of this Council, represents it: John and his Faction of 30 Bishops, sent them a Sentence of Deposition

in



in these Words: "Know ye y, thou *Cyris* Bishop  
 " of *Alexandria*, and thou *Memnon* Bishop of *E-*  
 " *phesus*, that ye are Deposed, and deprived of  
 " your Episcopacy, and all Ecclesiastical Mini-  
 " stry whatsoever." And the same may be seen  
 in the first Session of the Council of *Ephesus*,  
 where the Acts <sup>z</sup> of the Schismatical Synod are  
 related. To this *Cyris* and the Council of *Eph-*  
*esus* replied upon the aforesaid Catholick Princi-  
 ples, that the Sentence of Deposition pronoun-  
 ced against them was of no Authority or Force,  
 because the thirty Bishops who decreed it, were  
 divested of Legal Power; they had no Autho-  
 rity as Priests to sit Judges upon others; they  
 had lost the Power of the Keys, and their Ex-  
 communications or Absolutions were equally  
 Insignificant, because they were not Men rightly  
 qualified to perform such Actions: For of those  
 thirty Bishops, some of them were meer Wan-  
 derers, without any Churches; others had been  
 Legally Deposed many Years ago by their  
 Metropolitans for great and scandalous Of-  
 fences;

F

y *Liberat. Breviar. cap. 6.* Scitote quod Depositi estis, &  
 alieni ab Episcopatu, Cyrille Alexandrine Episcopo, & tu  
 Memnon hujus Civitatis, & omni Ecclesiastico Ministerio a-  
 lien.

<sup>z</sup> *Conc. Ephes. Act. 1. Conc. Tom. 3. p. 590.* Under this Ti-  
 tle, Acta Conciliabuli, in quo Johannes Antiochenus & Ori-  
 entales quidam Episcopi Cyrillum ac Memnonem deposu-  
 erunt, & excommunicarunt omnes qui ad Synodum con-  
 venerant.

*Ibid. p. 598.* Tu Cyrille Alexandrine, & tu Memnon hujus  
 Civitatis Episcopo, Scitote vos depositos, & ab Episcopatu  
 alienos, & ab omni Ministerio Ecclesiastico amotos, &c.



fences<sup>a</sup>; and some of them were *Pelagian* and *Celestian* Hereticks, and others had been ejected out of *Thessaly* as Criminals, who now pretended, with *John* of *Antioch*, to Depose or Excommunicate an universal Synod, which was an Impious Pretence to an Authority which they had not the least claim to, who had only the Name of Bishops, without the Power, which they had forfeited by being justly Deposed. Does not all this suppose, in the Judgment of this Council, that Hereticks, and Schismatics, and Degraded Clerks, lose their Authority Ministerial by a Legal Deposition; so that thenceforward they have no Authority to Bind or Loose, to Excommunicate or Absolve, or perform Authoritatively any other Acts of the Ministerial Function? If it does not, I despair of ever understanding Mens Meaning by their Words. But if it does, then it is undeniably evident, that Priests may be divested of their Ministerial Authority, in the Opinion of this General Council.

It were easy to transcribe almost half a Volume upon the same Subject, out of the several Acts and Records of this Council: But that my Friend may not complain again, that I send him to Books which he cannot easily come by, I will here subjoin two or three Canons of this Council, which are in every ones hands; and they are

---

<sup>a</sup> *Con. Ephes. Ep. Synod. ad Celestin. Act. 1. Conc. Tom. 3. p. 663.* Johannes Antiochenus, collecto Collegio hominum circiter triginta numero, qui nomen habebant Episcoporum, ex quibus alii erant extorres, otiosi, Ecclesiisque carentes, alii ante multos annos ob graves culpas à suis Metropolitanis depositi; cum ipsis etiam Pelagiani & Cælestiani, ac non nulli de iis qui ex Thessalia ejecti fuerunt, rem ausus est impiam.



are as full to the Purpose, as what has been already alledged out of the Acts of the Synod.

The Preface to these Canons is their Encyclical Epistle to all Churches, wherein they speak of those thirty Schismatical Bishops, who made a separate Synod under *John of Antioch*; of whom they give the same Account and Character as we have heard before: That they had <sup>b</sup> no Power or Faculty, as from any Authority of the Priesthood, either to Hurt or Benefit any one thereby; because some of them were Deposed, but especially because they embraced the Opinions of *Nestorius* and *Cælestius*: And therefore the Holy Synod, by a common Decree, excluded them from all Ecclesiastical Communion, and took from them all the Power or Energy of the Priesthood, which enabled them to do Good or Hurt to others. Their Meaning is, That they deprived them of all Authority as Priests, to Excommunicate or Absolve, or perform any other Ministerial Acts, that might have a Spiritual Effect on others. And if this did not render them Unauthorized Persons, it is hard to say what would. Their first Canon is levelled against all such Metropolitans as forsook the œcumenical Synod, and joined with the Schismatical Conventicle, or embraced the Heresy of *Cælestius*: Such an one

F 2

should

<sup>b</sup> Conc. Ephes. Epist. Encycl. Μηδεμίαν ἔχοντες ἀδελφάν, ὡς ἔξ ἀνθεντίας ἱερατικῆς, εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι τινὰς ἐν ταύτης ἐλάττειν ἢ ὠφελεῖν, διὰ τὸ καὶ τινὰς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἔχειν καθεστημένους &c. "Οὓς τινὰς δόγματι κοινῷ ἢ ἀγία σύνοδος πίσεως μὲν Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς κοινωνίας ἀλλοτείας ἐποίησεν, πᾶσαν δὲ αὐτῶν ἐνέργειαν ἱερατικὴν περὶ αὐτῶν, εἰ ἢ ἐδύναντο ἐλάττειν ἢ ὠφελεῖν πῶς.



should have no Power<sup>c</sup> to do any thing against his Provincial Bishops, being cast out of all Ecclesiastical Communion by the Synod, and rendered incapable of performing any Ecclesiastical Office: Nay, he should be subjected to the Bishops of his own Province, and the neighbouring Metropolitans, in every thing, being degraded from the Order of Episcopacy. In the next Canon<sup>d</sup> they determine the same against all Bishops that joined in the Schismatical Synod, That they, according to the Decree of the Holy Synod, were altogether divested of the Priesthood and fall'n from their Order. These are not the Words of Men that supposed that Hereticks or Schismatics, or Deposed Priests, could act still with the Authority of Priests, after they were degraded and fall'n from their Order.

In the third Canon they decree, that all such Clerks as were interdicted the Priestly Office by *Nestorius*, for their Orthodoxy, should be restored to their Station again: And thenceforward no Clerk should be subject to an Apostatizing Bishop upon any Account, or in any Respect whatsoever. This certainly supposes that degraded Hereticks had no longer Authority, as Bishops or Priests, to censure or exact Obedience from their Subjects. And yet the Power of the Keys was one of the most authentick and appro-

c Conc. Ephes. Can. 1. Οὕτω κατὰ τῆς τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπων διατρέψεται π' ἑαυμῶς δύναται, πάσης Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς κοινωνίας ἐν Ἰεϋδαίᾳ ἥδη ὑπὸ τῆς συνόδου ἐκβεβλημένων, καὶ ἀνενέργησιν ὑπάρχον καὶ τῷ βαθμῷ τῆς Ἐπισκοπῆς ἐκβληθέναι.

d Can. 2. ibid. Τέτους πάντα κατὰ τὸ δοξαζομένην τῇ ἀγίᾳ συνόδῳ ἀλλοτείνεσθαι τῆς ἰερωσύνης καὶ τῷ βαθμῷ ἐκπίπτουσιν.



appropriate Ingredients of the Episcopacy and Priesthood: But they having lost both the Key of Knowledge and the Key of Government, Submission and Obedience to them, as Priests and Ministers of God, in this degraded State, was no longer due unto them.

In the fourth Canon they decree, that if any Clerks Apostatize, and, either Publickly or Privately, hold the Opinions of *Nestorius* or *Celestius*, they are Deposed by the Holy Synod.

*Τέτρες εἶναι καθεγεμένους.*

And in the fifth Canon, if any Clerks are condemned by this Holy Synod, or their own Bishops for their Crimes; and *Nestorius* or any of his Accomplices attempt to restore them to Communion, or to their Order; this shall not profit them: They are to remain Deposed notwithstanding. Whence it is plain, that *Nestorius* being Legally Deposed, had no Authority to Absolve or Restore any to Communion, by Vertue of any Indelible Character of a Bishop remaining in him. And, tho' he had absolved them a Thousand times, his Authority would have signified nothing, till the Church by her Authentick and Authoritative Acts had reinstated them.

In the sixth Canon all who shall pretend to evacuate or set aside any of the Acts of the Council of *Ephesus*, if they be Bishops or Clerks, they do totally fall from their Order, *τῷ δικαίῳ παντελῶς ἀποπίπτειν βαθμῇ*, and if Laymen, they are Excommunicate. And can Men have the Authority of Priests or Bishops, when they are totally fall'n from their Order? No certainly, no more than Laymen have a Right or Authority to demand the Communion, whilst they are Excommunicate by the Council.



The last Canon decrees, That if any one use the Impious Creed of *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*, proposed by *Charisius* in the Council, or any other Creed beside that of *Nice*, if they were Bishops, they were deprived of their Episcopal Order, and if Clerks, deprived of their Clerical Order, ἀλλοτείνεσθαι τὰς ἐπισκόπους τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, καὶ τὰς κληρικὸς τῆ κλήρῳ, and if Laymen, they were Anathematized, or under the Sentence of the greater Excommunication.

These seven are all the Canons which the Council of *Ephesus* made, and we see they are all upon this one Point, to take away the Ministerial Authority of Bishops and Priests from them, in Case of Heresy or any such Crime, for which they incurred the Censures of the Synod: And a Man may as well say, That Black is White, as say, That the Council of *Ephesus* thought these Men had still the Authority of Ministers of CHRIST, when they, by the Authority of GOD and CHRIST, had taken their Authority from them. And yet the Baptisms given by such Men in this Unauthorized State, were not repeated; the Persons they baptized, while they were divested of their Ministerial Power, were not rebaptized when they came over to the Church, but only received with Imposition of Hands and Confirmation, as I have shewed, particularly of the *Nestorians*, in the First Part of this *Scholastical History*, to which I refer the Reader.

## §. 5.

*How the Council of Chalcedon Deposed Euryches and Dioscorus and their Adherents.*

Come we now to the fourth General Council, the Great Council of *Chalcedon*, where above Six - hundred Bishops met, under *Marcian* the Emperor,



peror, *An. 451.* to condemn the Heresies of *Eutyches* and *Dioscorus*, who denied the Consubstantiality of *CHRIST's* Humane Nature with that of ours, as *Arius* had denied the Consubstantiality of his Divine Nature with that of the Father. *Eutyches* had been once Condemned before in the Council of *Constantinople* under *Flavian*, *An. 448.* the Acts of which Council are inserted into the first Action or Session of the Council of *Chalcedon*. There we find the first Sentence of Deprivation passed upon him in these terms, by *Flavian* and 56 Bishops and Archimandrites: "We decree him, by the Power of our Lord *JESUS CHRIST*, whom he hath Blasphemed, to be deprived of his Priestly Order<sup>e</sup>, and our Communion, and the superintendency of his Monastery; and all those who converse with him, to be obnoxious to the same Excommunication." And there they call him only, *A Quondam Presbyter*, ὁ πάλαι πρεσβύτερος, as supposing him to be no longer a Presbyter after he was thus Deposed from his Order. This Decree indeed was pretendedly cancelled by the Second Council of *Ephesus*, commonly called, *The Latrocinial Synod*, or, *The Synod of Robbers*, because it turned the Temple of *GOD* into a Den of Thieves, by Condemning *Flavian*, and Absolving *Eutyches*<sup>f</sup>, at the Instigation of *Dioscorus* Bishop of *Alexandria*. But the Attempt of this Synod was quickly reversed by the Authority of the Great Council of

F 4

Chal-

<sup>e</sup> Conc. Constant. Act. 7. in Act. 1. Conc. Chalced. Con. Tom. 4. p. 230. ὡρίσαμεν -- αὐτὸν ἀλλότριον εἶναι παντὸς ἐκκλησιᾶς τῆς πίστεως, καὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς κοινωνίας, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, &c.

<sup>f</sup> Vid. Act. Conc. Ephes. secundi in Actione primâ Conc. Chalced. p. 256.



*Chalcedon*, which Condemned both *Dioscorus* and *Eutyches* in a very remarkable manner. *Dioscorus* is often Deposed in these Forms: *Δεὸς* *καθάρσεν* ὁ Θεὸς καὶ θεῖλεν, *GOD* hath Deposed *Dioscorus*; *CHRIST* hath Deposed *Dioscorus*<sup>h</sup>; *CHRIST* hath Deposed the Murderer: The Holy Synod hath divested him of Episcopal Dignity<sup>i</sup> and Deprived him of all the Honour and Ministry of the Priesthood.

And it is farther remarkable, that in the Sentence of Deposition pronounced against him, they declare him Deprived of all Sacerdotal Grace and Office without hopes<sup>k</sup> of Restitution, because he contumaciously contemned the Citations and Admonitions of the Synod. *Liberatus* takes notice of the same things in his Account of this Council. He says, The whole Council<sup>l</sup> cryed out, *GOD hath Deposed Dioscorus*, *GOD hath Deposed the Murderer*. And that they gave it in Command to the Clergy of *Alexandria*

<sup>g</sup> Conc. Chalced. Act. 2. p. 371.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. Act. 1. p. 831. Edit. Crab. p. 310. Ed. Labbe.

<sup>i</sup> Act. 3. p. 847. Edit. Crab. p. 427. Edit. Labbe. *Alienans eum ab omni Sacerdotali Ministerio & Dignitate. See the several Subscriptions of particular Bishops in that Session. p. 439. Ego Cyrus Alienans eum iudico à Pontificatus Collegio & omni Sacerdotali ministerio. Another says, Dignus est alienus esse à Sacerdotali Ordine, & ab omni Ministerio & Communionem, &c.*

<sup>k</sup> Conc. Chalced. Act. 3. in Edicto cont. Dioscor. p. 459. and 461.

<sup>l</sup> *Liberat. Breviar. c. 13. Acclamavit omne Concilium, Dioscorum Deus deposuit, Homicidam Deus deposuit. Clericis vero Alexandrinis mandavit Concilium, jam eum non putare, Episcopum esse, sed omnino cognoscerent eum de Gradu suo esse dejectum. Sed & aliquibus putantibus Dioscorum recuperare posse Episcopatum, propositum est Edictum, & omnibus manifestatum est, Dioscorum irrecuperabiliter honore fuisse abjectum.*



*Alexandria* then present at *Chalcedon*, that they should not henceforward esteem him a Bishop, but look upon him as one entirely Degraded from his Order. And because some thought that *Dioscorus* might recover his Bishoprick again, they published an Edict, declaring *Dioscorus* to be irrecoverably deprived of his Honour. Can any thing be more Solemn, Full, or Authentick than this Deposition? which is said to be done by GOD and CHRIST; which deprives him not only of Episcopacy, but of all Ecclesiastical Ministry and Sacred Function; which orders his own Clergy to look upon him as no Bishop, but as an Abject or Castaway, irrecoverably Degraded, without hopes of Restitution; that he was expelled the College of Bishops, and the Order of Priests, and had now not so much as the Name or Appellation of a Bishop left him. Can any Man think they took him for an Authorized Minister of CHRIST, after they themselves, by the Power of CHRIST, had so solemnly Unauthorized him, without hopes of Restitution? Whatever there may be in the Indelible Character of a Bishop or Priest, it is certain this Council did not think it Authorized him to Act as a Lawful Bishop, after so full and ample a Deposition. Tho' we should suppose it preserv'd him in a Capacity to minister as a Priest, without a new Ordination, if ever the Council should think fit to restore him to his Ministerial Authority again; yet he could not be said to minister with Authority, whilst he remained in that Deposed State, and all the Power of Heaven and Earth had taken his Authority from him. And yet we no where read, That the Baptisms given by *Dioscorus* or his Adherents, were at any time Repeated; or that any *Eutychians* were re-



rebaptized upon their Return to the Catholick Church.

The Condemnation of *Eutyches* himself was Parallel to this of *Dioscorus*. I shall but trouble the Reader with one Instance of it, out of the Edict of the Emperor *Marcian*, where he Confirms the Acts and Sentence of the Council against him. In *Crab's* Edition it is inserted into the third Session of the Council, P. 866. But in *Labbe's* Edition it is found at the end of all the Acts, among other Records relating to this Council; and it is in these words: "By this  
" Law<sup>m</sup> we decree, That they who are de-  
" ceived by the Errors of *Eutyches*, shall have  
" no Bishop, nor Presbyter, nor have, nor  
" create, nor name any Men Clerks; and that  
" *Eutyches* himself shall be totally deprived of  
" the Name of Presbyter, of which he is Un-  
" worthy and divested. But if any shall pre-  
" sume, against this our Order, to create Bishops  
" or Presbyters, or other Clerks; both they that  
" Create such Clerks, and they that are so Cre-  
" ated, or assume to themselves the Degree of  
" Clerks, shall have their Goods Confiscated,  
" and be confined to perpetual Banishment."  
Now then, if according to the Sentence of the Council, and this Ratification of it, *Eutyches* and his

---

<sup>m</sup> *Edict. Marciani, ad Calcem Conc. Chalced. Part. 3. cap 12: Con. Tom. 4. p. 868.* Hac Lege decernimus, eos, qui Eutychetis decipiuntur errore ----- nullum Episcopum, nullum habere Presbyterum, nullos habere, al. creare vel appellare Clericos; ipsumque Eutychem nomine Presbyteri (quo & indignus & spoliatus est) in totum carere. Si qui tamen contra Definita nostra, Episcopos, Presbyteros, ceterosque Clericos ausi fuerint creare, tam factos, quam facientes, vel præsumentes sibi Clericorum gradum, bonorum amissione percussos, exilio perpetuo præcipimus contineri.



his Adherents were so deprived of all Ministerial Offices, that they were not so much as to have the very Name of Bishops or Presbyters allowed them, nor might Create any under those Titles; What Authority could the *Eutychians* have after this to minister Baptism, or perform any other Acts of the Ministerial Function? They might do the things indeed, but they had no Authority to do them: They were as much Usurpers of the Office as the meere Layman. All the difference was, that the one never had Authority, and the other once had Authority, but forfeited and lost it, and, by their Heresy and Obstinacy, reduced themselves to a State and Condition one Degree below Laymen, by suffering themselves to be Legally Anathematized and cast out of the Communion of the Church. And yet after all, the Canons assure us, that they who were Baptized in due Form by these Unauthorized Usurpers, were not Rebaptized, but only had their Deficiencies supplied and compleated by Imposition of Hands and a proper Form of Confirmation.

I could give other Instances to the purpose, out of the remaining Acts of this Council, but I chuse rather to say something of its Canons; among which there are no less than Eight, which specify certain Crimes for which a Clerk is deposed or fall'n from his Order. The second Canon is against Ordination for Money, in which Case both the Ordainer and Ordained, and also any other who is Instrumental or a Mediator in the Crime, if he be a Clerk, is deprived of his Order, *Τὸ δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐκείνου ἐκείνου ἐκείνου*. So if a Clerk forsakes his own Church without Leave, by the tenth Canon he incurs the same Censure, *Ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς τῆς αὐτῆς ἐκείνου*. If a Bishop procure his See by a Pragmatick Sanction, to be erected



erected into a Metropolis, to the Prejudice of his Lawful Metropolitan, by the twelfth Canon he makes himself liable to the like Degradation.

By the eighteenth Canon, Clergymen who are found guilty of Treason or Conspiracy against the Civil Government, are wholly to be Degraded from their Order, Ἐκτελέσονται πάντες οἱ ἱερεῖς βάρμης.

By the twenty-second Canon, Clergymen who commit Robbery upon the Goods of a deceased Bishop, are liable also to be Deposed.

And they who under pretence of Marriage, take Women by Force, or give Assistance to any that do so, are by the twenty-seventh Canon subjected to the same Censure.

The twenty-ninth Canon says, It is Sacrilege to degrade a Bishop to the Order of Presbyter: But if a just Cause removes him from the Episcopal Function; then he ought not to retain the Place of a Presbyter.

Now upon all these Canons I desire to know, whether if a Clerk be Formally and Judicially Deposed from his Order, as these Canons suppose, he has then any longer Authority to exercise the Ministerial Offices of his Function? To say, he has Authority still, seems to fly in the Face of all these Canons, and cut the Sinews of all Ecclesiastical Discipline, and leave the Church without a just Power of Censure. But supposing him to have no Authority after such a Deposition, what if in spite and contradiction to these Canons, he will go and join with Hereticks, or set up a παρανομιαν, a Conventicle of his own, erect an Altar against an Altar, and there Baptize, and perform all other Acts of the Ministerial Function, as many Degraded Bishops and Presbyters did: The Question is, Whe-



Whether all Persons Baptized by such a Degraded, Unauthorized Bishop or Priest, were Rebaptized by the Catholick Church? If they were, my Learned Opponents might easily have produced some Order of one of these General Councils to have proved it: If they were not Rebaptized, as it is evident they were not; then it is reasonable to conclude, as I here do, that the bare want of Authority in the Administrator of Baptism, did not wholly annul or make void the Baptism that was given in due Form by an Unauthorized Person; but had its want of Authority, with its other Deficiencies, supplied by the Authority of the Church in a subsequent Imposition of Hands and Confirmation; as is clearly evinced from the History of these Four first General Councils, compared with what has been said before of the Method of receiving such as were Baptized by Hereticks and Schismatics into the Communion of the Catholick Church. This Argument, I think, carries with it the conviction and strength of a Demonstration. The Baptism of Hereticks, and Schismatics, and Degraded Clerks, and Excommunicated Clerks, is the Baptism of Unauthorized Persons, according to the Sense of the Four first General Councils.

But the Baptism of Hereticks, Schismatics, Degraded Clerks, and Excommunicated Clerks, if ministred in due Form, was always received by the Church without Rebaptizing.

Therefore the Baptism of Unauthorized Persons, if ministred in due Form, was always received by the Church without Rebaptizing.

But



§. 6.  
Of the Condemnation of Anathimus and Severus in the Council of Constantinople, under Mennas, An. 536.

But I go on with the present History. There are two Synods of Constantinople which lay some Claim to the Title and Appellation of the Fifth General Council, both of them in the Time of Justinian, the former under Mennas, Patriarch of Constantinople, An. 536, and the other under Pope Vigilius, An. 553. In Crab's Edition of the Councils, that under Mennas has the Name of the Fifth General Council; but in Labbe the Title is given to the latter. I shall join them together, and out of both we shall be sure to have a General Council. That under Mennas was called against Anathimus, Bishop of Trebisonde; Severus, Bishop of Antioch; Peter, Bishop of Apamea; and Zoaras, a Monk; with other Hereticks, who went by the Name of Acephali, and were a Branch of the Eutychian Heresy, but they were called Acephali, that is, without Head, because the first Authors of the Sect at Alexandria, separated from their Bishop, and held Conventicles, and gave Baptisms in Private Houses, which are therefore frequently called, Παρασυναγωγαὶ, & Παραβαπτίσματα, in the Acts of this Council. Anathimus was first condemned by Pope Agapetus, whose Epistle was read in Council, declaring him<sup>n</sup> to be neither worthy the Name of a Catholick, nor the Name of a Priest. And this Sentence was ratified and confirmed over and over again by the Council, who

<sup>n</sup> Agapet. Epist. ad Petrum in Act. 1. Concil. sub Menna. p. 47. Οὐδὲ καθολικὸν ἐστὶ ἱερέως ὀνόματι ἀξίον εἶναι ὑποτίθουσαν.



who more solemnly pronounce ° him to be cast out of the Priesthood, and divested for the future of all Sacred Appellation, Dignity, Energy or Power whatsoever. And in another place, p Excommunication is added to the Sentence of Deposition: So that nothing could be wanting to deprive him of all manner of Sacerdotal Authority and Power. The like Sentence of Deposition was pronounced against *Severus*, by four several Synods, whose Synodical Epistles are related and approved in this Council, viz. the Synod of *Jerusalem*, the Synod of *Tyre*, the Synod of *Syria Secunda*, and a former Synod of *Constantinople*, whose q Sentence runs in these Words, “ We subject this *Severus* to a perpetual “ *Anathema*, and deprive him of all Honour, “ Name, Dignity, Operation or Power belong- “ ing to a Priest or a Christian, and exclude “ him from the Holy Communion, according “ to the Canons.” After this Deposition *Justinian* published an Imperial Edict against them, which is still extant among his Novels r, wherein he confirms all that had been done by the Church in the Deposition of *Anthimus*, *Severus*,  
Peter,

o Ibid. Act. 4. p. 61. Ἱερωσύνης ἔξω καθεστῆναι συγχωρεῖται, πάσης τε ἐτέρας αὐτὸν ἱερατικῆς λειτουργείας ἀμα καὶ ἀξίας καὶ ἐνεργείας ἀλλότριον εἶναι τὰ λοιπὰ.

p Ibid. p. 87.

q Conc. CP. in Act. 1. Concilii sub Menna. p. 36. Edit. Crab. Hunc juste perpetuo Anathemati subicimus, omni Honore, Nomine, Dignitate, Operatione (in Greek ἐνέργεια) tam Christiano quàm Hieratico conveniente, vel convenire valente, privantes, & nudum Divinæ Communionis Statuentes. In Labbe it is Actio. 5.

r *Justin. Novel. 42. cap. 3.* Sancimus quemlibet talium silentium ducere, & non convocare aliquos ad se, neque accedentes recipere, aut Parabaptizare audere, aut sacram Communionem sordidare, & ipsam aliquibus tradere, &c.



*Peter*, and *Zoaras*, and their Accomplices, forbidding them to hold Conventicles, or to Baptize, or give the Eucharist, or Preach, or do any other Office of the Sacerdotal Function. Now it is well known, that notwithstanding both the Deprivation of so many Synods, and the Imperial Edicts against them, these Men set up Conventicles, and administred Baptism therein. For Complaint was made of this against *Zoaras* the Monk, in the Council under *Mennas*<sup>s</sup>, and he and his Accomplices were again Censured upon it by the general Sentence of the Synod. But those Censures did not extend to the Rebaptization of all such as had been Baptized by these Unauthorized Persons. The Hereticks were indeed divested of Ministerial Power, but those whom they Baptized were received as the Laws directed the *Eutychians* should be, by Imposition of Hands, without Rebaptizing, upon their Repentance.

## §. 7.

*How the Defenders of the Tria Capitula were degraded in the fifth General Council of Constantinople.*

The other Council of *Constantinople* under *Justinian*, An. 553. which, in the new Editions of the Councils, now bears the Title of the fifth General Council, consisted of 165 Bishops, who were called together to condemn the *Tria Capitula*, i. e. three noted Books, which the *Nestorians* made great use of to defend their Heresy, which were, *The Writings of Theodorus, of Mopsuestia*; *The Epistle of Maris to Ibas the Persian*; and,

<sup>s</sup> *Conc. Constant. sub Menna Aſt. i. p. 70. Edit. Crab.*  
 Quanquam piſſimus Imperator noſter mandaverit non recon-  
 venticulare, neque rebaptizare, Zoaras tamen tale præceptum  
 deſpexit, & parabaptizavit in die Paſchæ non paucos.



and, *The Reflexions of Theodoret upon Cyril of Alexandria.* Here also the Errors of *Origen* were condemned. But all these were dead Men and gone to another World to answer for themselves. All therefore that the Censures or Anathema's of the Council could signify to them, was little, save only as they were of use to reclaim the Living, and deter them from embracing or encouraging the Errors of the Dead. And, to do this effectually, they made a solemn Decree, That if any one<sup>t</sup> endeavoured, either by Teaching or Writing, to propagate Tenets contrary to what had been piously determined in the Council; if he were a Bishop or a Clerk, he should be deprived of his Episcopal or Clerical Order; or if he were a Monk or Layman, he should be Anathematized. Now here it is very obvious for any one to observe, that as being Anathematized deprives a Monk or Layman of all the Power and Privilege of Church Communion, that belongs to a Layman; so the Deposing of a Bishop or Clerk from his Episcopal or Clerical Office, deprives them of all the Authority and Privilege that belongs to Clerical Communion: And the presence of an Indelible Character does no more secure any Authority to them in the one Case, than it does in the other. For as the Indelible Character of Baptism does not give a Layman Authority and Right to challenge Communion,

G

whilst

<sup>t</sup> *Constant. Conc. 5. General. Collat. 8. Conc. Tom. 5. p. 579.*  
 Si quis conatus fuerit contraria his quæ à nobis piè terminata sunt, tradere, aut docere, aut scribere; siquidem Episcopus est, aut in Clero, *Τυμνωθήσεται τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἢ τῆς κλήρης*; si autem Monachus aut Laicus fuerit, anathematizabitur.



whilst he stands legally Excommunicate by the Church; but only a Right to be restored to Communion again, when he truly repents, without a new Baptism: So the Indelible Character of Ordination does not give a Bishop or Priest any Authority to challenge to himself the Powers of Clerical Communion, that is, Authority to perform the Offices of a Bishop or Priest, so long as they are legally Degraded by the Church; but only a Power or Capacity to officiate again without a new Ordination, if ever the Church shall think fit to give them Authority so to do, by a Relaxation of her Censures, and permission to return to their ancient State again; which upon great Necessities the Church sometimes did, but this not very often. Now if this be the Truth of the Case; then all the Defenders of the *Tria Capitula* and the Errors of *Origen*, were truly divested of Clerical Authority by this Council: And yet their *Παρακαθήματα*, their Unauthorized Baptisms, were not repeated: For we never read of any *Nestorian* or *Eutychian*, who were Baptized in due Form, that was Rebaptized in the Church.

## §. 8.

*How the Sixth General Council of Constantinople, deposed and anathematized the Monothelites.*

The Sixth General Council was held at Constantinople, under *Constantius Pogonatus*, An. 680. Here met 289 Bishops to condemn the Heresy of the *Monothelites*, which were another Branch of the *Eutychians*, so called, because they asserted but one Will in our Saviour, thereby undermining and destroying the Perfection of his Humane Nature. This Heresy had for some time prevailed, both at *Rome* and *Constantinople*: For Pope *Honorius* was a Defender of



of it, who is therefore, together with *Sergius*, *Cyrus*, *Paulus*, and several others frequently Anathematized after Death in the Acts of this Council. But that which we are to enquire into is, What Censures here passed upon the Living. And among these we have the Deposition of *Macarius* Bishop of *Antioch*, and *Stephen* a Monk, one of his Presbyters. In the eighth Session, *Macarius*, whom they call the new *Dioscorus*, and the new *Apollinarius*, is ordered <sup>v</sup> first to be divested of his Pall and deprived of his Bishoprick. Then, in the ninth Session, the Sentence is formally pronounced against him and *Stephen* his Disciple, in these words: "We declare you <sup>w</sup> deprived of all Sacerdotal Dignity and Ministry." And upon this *Stephen* was immediately driven out of the Council. In the twelfth Session, after having heard all that *Macarius* had to say, he is again declared justly and canonically deprived of his Archiepiscopal Habit, and all Power of Teaching from the Doctors Chair, <sup>x</sup> that he might not spread his Heresy any farther. And whereas he had presumed to say, *If he was cut in pieces, Limb from Limb, and cast into the Sea, he would not own two Wills or two Operations* (ἐνέργειας) in Christ; the Council therefore declares him Synodically Deposed and Anathematized also, and wholly without Right to sit

G 2

<sup>v</sup> Conc. 6. Gen. Act. 8. p. 321. Edit. Crab. Edit. Labbe, p. 760. Conc. Tom. 6.

<sup>w</sup> Ibid. Act. 9. p. 326. Edit. Crab. at Edit. Labbe, 778.

<sup>x</sup> Οοίζομεν ὑμᾶς πάσης ἱερατικῆς ἀξίας καὶ λειτουργίας ἄλλοτρίως ἐκάρχειν.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. Act. 12. p. 937. Labbe. Διχαίως καὶ κηρυονικῶς ἐπὶ τῷ ἀρχιερατικῷ θήματι γυμνωθέντα, ἑδαμῶς ὁ Θεὸς κλητῶν παραβήσας τὴ λοιπὴν ἡς διδασκαλικὴν καθήκον θέσει γεν. &c.



ἐν ἱερατικῷ θρόνῳ, in the Sacerdotal Chair for the future.

In the fifteenth Session, one *Polychronius*, a Monk, pretended to work a Miracle, by raising the Dead, in confirmation of the *Monothelite* Doctrine: Which he having attempted in vain, the Council condemned him as an Impostor, and a Blasphemer, and a manifest Heretick, declaring him to be deprived of all the Order y and Ministry of a Priest. And so having Deposed him, the Holy Synod cried out, *Anathema to Polychronius and his Accomplices. Anathema to Macarius, Stephanus, and Polychronius. The Trinity hath Deposed these Three.* Ἡ Τριάς τὰς τρεῖς καθείλεν.

At the end of the sixteenth Session they are all again Anathematized with *Honorius*, and the rest of the Hereticks that were dead before. And in the close of the eighteenth Session, having read the *Nicene* and *Constantinopolitan* Creeds, the Council concludes, That whoever presumed to compose any other Faith, or propose, or teach, or hand down any other Creed to new Converts, turning either from Gentilism, Judaism, or any Heresy; or offered to introduce any new Terms, contrary to what the present Council had agreed upon; if they were Bishops or Clerks, they should be deprived z of their Episcopal or Clerical Order: And if Laymen, be Anathematized, or cast out of the Church.

In

y Ibid. Act. 15. p. 999. Labbe. Πάσης ἱεραλικῆς τάξεως καὶ λειτουργίας γυμνωθῆναι.

z Ibid. Act. 18. p. 1027. Ἀλλοτρίους ἢ τὰς ἐπισκόπους τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, καὶ τὰς κληρικὸς τῆς κλήσεως.



In consequence of these Decrees, all such Bishops as herded with *Macarius* and the *Monothelites*, are declared to be out of the College of Bishops, by Pope *Agatho* and his *Roman Council*, whose Synodical Epistle <sup>a</sup> to this Council is related in the fourth Session. And *Constantine Pogonatus*, the Emperor, in his *Sacra*, or Edict, where he confirms the Acts of the Council, uses a like Expression, where he says, "The Council had banished <sup>b</sup> all such Heretical Priests from the Sacerdotal Fold; that is, from the Confraternity and Society of the Sacred Order." In like manner as *Leo* the second Bishop of *Rome*, writing to this same Emperor, concerning the Proceedings of the present Synod against *Macarius* and his Accomplices, says, "That *Macarius* being found to be a Wolf <sup>c</sup> in Sheep's Cloathing, and a Thief and a Robber, instead of a Shepherd, was by the true Shepherds of CHRIST's Flock, (meaning the Sixth General Council) abdicated as a Waster and Destroyer: For they deposed him from his Prelatical Dignity, and his Disciple *Stephen*, with *Polychronius*, the new *Simon Magus*, from the Honour of their Priesthood.

How could a Degradation be expressed in more ample and significant Terms than these? They are Deposed not only from the Honour and Chair, but from the Ministry, the Order, and the Offices of the Priesthood; from Preaching and all other Operations belonging to the

G 3

Sacred

<sup>a</sup> Conc. Rom. in 4. Act. Conc. 6. Gen. p. 689.

<sup>b</sup> Constantin. Edict. ad Calcem Conc. 6. Gen. p. 1085.

Τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἑξωστρέμισαν αὐλῆς. &c.

<sup>c</sup> Leo. Epist. ad Constant. ibid. p. 1117.



Sacred Function. And they are Deposed not only by Man, but GOD: For the Holy Trinity Deposed them. And being so, they were no longer owned by the rest of the Bishops, as Fellow-Bishops, or Fellow-Ministers, or Spiritual Brethren, but looked upon as Wolves, and Thieves, and Robbers, who could not be admitted into the College of Bishops, till some wonderful Change was wrought in them. And is it possible to think, that Men of this Character, under all the Disadvantages of Heresy, Excommunication, and Deposition from their Order by the Trinity itself, should still be looked upon as true Ministers of GOD; as still invested with a sufficient Authority to perform any Ministerial Acts, by vertue of an Original Ordination implanting a Power in them, that no Power on Earth could wholly take from them? If the Power of the Church was not sufficient to deprive them of this pretended Authority, yet sure the Power of the Holy Trinity, the Fountain of all Spiritual Authority and Power, must be owned all-sufficient to take away the Authority, which it at first gave them. And then we have as full Proof, that these *Eutychian* Hereticks were divested of their whole Ministerial Authority, as can possibly be given. Yet there is no Order or Decree, in this or any other Council, for Rebaptizing such as were in due Form Baptized by these Unauthorized Hereticks, but the contrary; for all the *Eutychians* are appointed to be received only by Imposition of Hands and Confirmation.



To what has been said of the six General Councils, I shall add the Sense of the Council of Trullo, which is, as it were, but an Appendix to the two last of them. For, because no Canons of Discipline were made in those two Synods, this Council was called on purpose, *An. 692*, or, as *Petavius* computes, *An. 707* under *Justinian* the Second, to supply the Defects of the two former Councils, whence it had the name of *Quinisextum*, the fifth and sixth Council together. There are above Thirty Canons in this Council, which order Bishops and Clerks to be Degraded for several Crimes there specially noted: But I shall only mention two or three that are a little more remarkable. In the Twenty-first Canon some Criminals are subjected to a total and perpetual <sup>d</sup> Deposition, and thrust down to the Place and State of Laymen, there to exercise themselves in Repentance for ever, without hopes of Restitution. In the Twenty-second Canon, if a Bishop or any other Clerk is Simoniacally Ordained for Money <sup>e</sup>, they that are Ordained, and they that Ordained them, are both ordered equally to be Deposed. And in the next Canon, every Clerk is subject to the same Penalty, that takes Money for Administring the Communion, as guilty <sup>f</sup> of a Simoniacal Error and Wickedness. In the Twenty-sixth

<sup>d</sup> Conc. Trull. can. 21. Παντελεῖ καὶ διηνεκεῖ καθαιρέσει ὑποβαλλόμενοι, καὶ ἐν τῷ τῶν λαϊκῶν ἀποδέμενοι τόπῳ, &c.  
<sup>e</sup> Ibid. can. 22. Τὲς ἐπὶ χρήμασι χειροτονημένους καθαιρέσειν προσάσσομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὲς χειροτονήσαντας.  
<sup>f</sup> Ibid. can. 23. Καθαίρειται ὡς τῆς Σίμωνος ζήλοτης πλάνης καὶ κακουργίας.



ty-sixth Canon, a Priest that marries unlawfully, tho' it be by Ignorance, is allowed to retain the Honour of his Chair, but he must forbear all Sacred Offices: He must neither give <sup>g</sup> the Blessing Publickly nor Privately, nor distribute the Body of CHRIST to others, nor do any other Ministerial Act. And a Reason is given for all this, Because such an one wants a Cure for his own Wounds, and the Blessing of Sanctification himself, and he cannot impart that to others which he himself wants, but he must weep out his Sins before the Lord by a perpetual Repentance.

Now upon these Canons, I would ask these plain Questions: Whether Priests, totally degraded, and thrust down to the place of Laymen, could be supposed, by this Council, to act, after this, as Authorized Ministers of CHRIST? Whether Bishops or Priests, Deposed for Simony, were still invested with the true Rights and Power of the Ministerial Function? Whether that which makes an Ordination void as soon as it is given (as Symony does) doth not likewise deprive a Man of Sacerdotal Authority, when he is afterward found guilty of it, and legally Deposed for it by the Church? And, Whether a Man, who is Lawfully forbidden, by the best Authority in the Church, to do any Ministerial Act whatsoever, can be said to perform those Acts by the Churches Authority, in opposition to her Lawful Commands? He that can reconcile these things by the help of two Words, called, *Indelible Character*, may enjoy his

---

<sup>g</sup> Conc. Trul. can. 26. Μήτε δημόσια μήτε ἰδίᾳ εὐλο-  
γῶ, μήτε τὸ σῶμα τῆ χειρὸς καταμένετω ἐπίθῃς, μήτε  
ἢ ἄλλο λειτουργῶ, &c.



his Opinion, for me, without Contradiction. I shall not think it worth while to dispute eternally with any one, who has such an infallible way of solving Difficulties by hard Names, or reconciling Contradictions by some dark and unintelligible School-Distinction. I hope I have plainly made it appear, to all unprejudiced Men, that there is no Foundation for asserting, that Hereticks, and Schismatics, and Degraded Priests, and Priests cast out of the Church with Anathema, are Authorized Ministers of the Church of CHRIST, from the History of the first Six General Councils. The consequence of which is, That the Baptisms given by such Unauthorized Persons could not be Valid by virtue of any true Ministerial Authority residing in such Persons, who were really and truly divested of it; but they must be received by the Church upon some other Principle, since it is certain she never allowed the Ministerial Authority of Hereticks, and yet received their Proselytes by Imposition of Hands without Rebaptizing.

CHAP.



## C H A P. II.

*The same Assertion proved from Patriarchal, National, and Provincial Councils, and from the Writings of Private Fathers, with several Arguments drawn from their Testimony. The first Argument, That some Hereticks, whose Baptism was received, never had Originally any real and true Ordination to the Ministerial Office and Function: Consequently they could be no other than Unauthorized Persons. This particularly proved upon the Novatian Hereticks.*

## §. 1.

*A short Reference to such Patriarchal, National, and Provincial Councils, as agree with the fore-mentioned General Councils.*

**A**fter the History of the Six General Councils, it will be needless to trouble every ordinary Reader with a particular Account of every Patriarchal, National, and Provincial Synod upon this Subject. And yet there is scarce one of these in all the *Tomes* of the Councils, where the same thing is not as plainly asserted. The Learned and Inquisitive Reader, that will be at the same Pains as I have been, may satisfy himself by having Recourse to them; for whose ease I will here give him a short Index or Reference to such Councils and Canons, as will give him satisfaction upon this Subject. There are some Provincial Councils, which are taken into the Code of the Church Universal, and so are of the Nature



ture of General Councils by their Confirmation. Such are the Council of *Ancyra*, Can. 1, 2, 10, 14. The Council of *Neocaesarea*, Can. 1, and 8. The Council of *Antioch*, Can. 1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13. Others are large Patriarchal Councils, next to General ones. Such are the Council of *Sardica*, Can. 1, 2, 4, 20. And the *African Code*, Can. 11, 15, 25, 27, 28, 31, 71, 81. In citing which Canons I follow the Edition of *Ebinger Witebergæ*, 1614. To these may be added those which are called the Apostolical Canons, because they were generally received in the *Greek Church*, Can. 3, 6, 7, 8, 12, 20, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 83. In all which Canons the Sentence of Deposition is pronounced against all such Clerks, as were found guilty of the several Crimes particularly specified in them. Other Councils were only National or Provincial; such as the Council of *Eliberis*, Can. 51, 76. The first Council of *Arles*, Can. 13, 22. The second Council of *Arles*, Can. 14, 15. The first Council of *Carthage*, Can. 2, 14. The Council of *Aquileia*, where *Palladius* the *Arian* was Deposed by St. *Ambrose*. The Council of *Colon. Agrippin.* where *Euphratas* Bishop of *Colon* was Deposed for *Arianism*. The fourth Council of *Carthage*, Can. 48, 49, 50, 56, 57, 60, 68, 69. The Council of *Turin*, Can. 2. The fifth Council of *Carthage*, Can. 3, 11, 12, 13. The first Council of *Toledo*, Can. 2, 4, 5. The Council of *Milevis*, Can. 18, 19, 22, 25. The Council of *Ries, Rhegiense*, Can. 1. The Council of *Agde*, Can. 1, 9, 49, 50, 60. The first Council of *Orange*, Can. 21. The Council of *Rome*, under *Hilary*, Can. 3. The Council



cil of *Tarraco*, Can. 2, 10. The Council of *Epone*, Can. 22. The Council of *Lerida*, Can. 5, 12, 16. The Council of *Valentia* in *Spain*, Can. 3. The Council of *Girone*, *Gerunda*, Can. 11. The second Council of *Toledo*, Can. 3. The second Council of *Orleans*, Can. 4, 8, 9, 13. The third Council of *Orleans*, Can. 2, 6, 7, 8, 15, 19, 26. The fourth Council of *Orleans*, Can. 10, 17. The fifth Council of *Orleans*, Can. 4, 10, 11. The fourth Council of *Toledo*, Can. 30, 44. The first Council of *Bracara*, Can. 32, 37. The eighth Council of *Toledo*, Can. 3, 4, 7, 8.

In these Canons there are almost an Hundred particular Crimes specified, for which Bishops and Clerks might be Deposed from their Office and Function. What then, if such Clerks should pretend to Officiate after they were Degraded, shall it be said, that such Persons were still Authorized Ministers of CHRIST, when the Church, in the name of CHRIST, had Unauthorized them, and, as some of them express it, Unordained them? When the Church had cancelled their Ministerial Authority, had they still Authority, in spite of the Churches Power, to Act as Lawful Ministers of GOD? or, Were all these Canons made to no other purpose, but to shew how insignificant the Churches Power and Discipline was; and how much Superior the Indelible Character of a Priest was, which could maintain his Authority, let the Church do what she would to Deprive him of it? Whatever some Mens Notions may be of the Priesthood, I question not, the generality of sober Readers will have more honourable Sentiments, than to think that a Wicked or Impious and Heretical Priest cannot possibly do any thing to  
for-



forfeit his Authority, if he has but once had a Regular Ordination: Or that the Church cannot justly Deprive him of this Authority, if he does such things as make him liable to a total and perpetual Deprivation. This were such an Affront to all these Councils, and their Authority, that I cannot think it needful to say any thing farther to any Wise Man to convince him of the Unreasonableness and Absurdity of such an Assertion. Therefore, instead of being more particular in the History of these several Councils, I will sum up the Force of them and other Private Writers in some proper Arguments, to shew, that all the Baptisms which the Church anciently received, were not given by true Authorized Ministers; which, without any farther Enquiry, must infallibly put an end to the Question about Lay-Baptism.

The first Argument I shall draw from the ancient Councils and Fathers, to this purpose, is founded upon the *Novatians* wanting a Real and Lawful Ordination. That the Church received their Baptisms, is a matter clear beyond all Dispute, and I know my Learned Antagonists will not pretend to question it: But, that these *Novatians* had a Lawful and true Ordination, is not so clear, but rather, from ancient History and Rules, it is clear to the contrary. For *Novatian* himself, who was the Father of the *Novatians*, was never Ordained a True and Lawful Bishop, but only was a Bishop in pretence: Therefore all such Ministers as derived the Original of their Orders and Authority from him, were only pretended Ministers

§. 2.

*The first Argument founded upon the Novatians wanting a true Ordination.*



sters, like their Founder. I know the Gentlemen with whom I now Dispute, will not offer to deny this, supposing *Novatian* was no true Bishop: But they will say that *Novatian* was a true Bishop, because he had three Bishops to Ordain him. And indeed if the Hands of three Bishops was all that was necessary to the true Ordination of a Bishop, then it could not be denied that *Novatian* was a true Bishop. But these Gentlemen cannot be Ignorant, that to a true Ordination something else is required besides the Hands of three Bishops: There are some Personal Qualifications requisite in the Party Ordained, and many Canonical Prescriptions to be observed in making a true Bishop, else his Ordination is Null and Void, *ab Origine*. For what if three Bishops should combine to Ordain a Child of three Years old, as the Popes have done some at seven, would such an Imposition of Hands pass for a true Ordination? What if three Bishops should be wrought upon by Simony to ordain a Man, who had no manner of Episcopal Qualifications? What if three Bishops should first be made Drunk with Wine, and then forced, against all Rules, and against their own Wills, to lay Hands on a Vile Wretch, who had not the least Pretence to an Ordination, would this be thought to give him the true Power and Authority of a Bishop, or be looked upon as such in any part of the Catholick Church? What if three Bishops should illegally concur to Ordain a Man an Anti-Bishop into a full See, where another was legally Ordained already, and in just and quiet Possession of the Church, would this Intruder be esteemed a true Bishop in any part of the World but *Utopia*, because of such a pretended Ordination? And yet



yet 'this was, in a great measure, the Case of *Novatian*. He had nothing beside his Age to qualify him to be Ordained a Bishop, of all the Particulars that have been mentioned.

For first, his Ordination was not only against his own Oath, but Simoniacal, and Forced into the Bargain. Some indeed have said, that he was Ordained only by *Novatus* a Priest: But that is a Mistake, for it is owned he had three Bishops to Ordain him. But then their manner of Proceeding was such as no Rules could justify: The Ordination which they gave him was Null from the very first: Because these three Bishops, being fetched from the farthest corner of *Italy*, had nothing to do to Ordain *Novatian* a Bishop at *Rome*, without a Regular and Synodical Election. They were made to believe, before they came there, that they should have a Synod of Bishops to join with them: But when *Novatian* had got them into his Possession, he set some of his Party to make them Drunk, and shut them up Prisoners, and then at four a clock in the Afternoon he compelled <sup>h</sup> them by Force to give him the Bishoprick by an Imaginary and Delusive and Vain Ordination, as *Cornelius* the true Bishop words it in his Epistle to *Fabian*, Bishop of *Antioch*, where he gives him an Account of

§. 3.

That *Novatian* was never a true Bishop, proved first, because he had only a Simoniacal and Forced Ordination.

<sup>h</sup> Euseb. Lib. 6. c. 43. p. 243. Συγκλειθέντας ὑπὸ πινῶν ὁμοίων αὐτῷ πεταγμένων ἀνδρώπων, ὥρα δεκάτῃ μεθύοντας καὶ κρηπαλῶντας μετὰ βιᾶς ἠνάγκασεν εἰκονικῇ καὶ ματαίᾳ χειροποιθεσίᾳ ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτῷ δοῦναι ἥν ἐνέειρα καὶ πανουργία μὴ ὅτι βάλλασαν αὐτῷ ἐκδικεῖν.



of the whole Proceeding; rightly concluding, that by this wicked Craft and Treachery, he usurped a Bishoprick, which did by no Right belong to him. And therefore this Episcopacy was only taken to himself by Robbery; it was not given him from Heaven<sup>i</sup>. Not long after, one of those three Bishops, as *Cornelius* adds, returned to the Church, confessing and bewailing his Crime. Whom *Cornelius*, at the Intercession of all the People, received into Communion, but only as a Layman, ἐκοινωνήσαμεν ὡς λαϊκῷ, and the other two he Deposed, and Ordained two Successors in their Room, and sent them to their Respective Places. This is also taken notice of by *Cyprian*<sup>k</sup>, who seems to say this Penitent Bishop's Name was *Trophimus*, who brought back with him a great Multitude of People from the Schism to the Church; which made his Admission so much the easier, because he made some sort of Satisfaction for his Crime thereby: Yet he was admitted only to Communicate in the Order of a Layman, and not allowed any longer to retain the place of a Priest. Nothing now can be plainer, than that, by this account, *Novatian's* pretended Ordination did not make him a true Bishop, nor give him Episcopal Authority to Ordain others. For if one of

<sup>i</sup> Euseb. Lib. 6. c. 43. p. 243. Παρεσπᾶσαι τε καὶ ὑπαρ-  
πάζειν τὴν μὴ δοδεΐσαν αὐτῷ ἀνωθεν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐπεχείρει.

<sup>k</sup> Cypr. Ep. 52. al. 55. ad Antonian. p. 105. Tractatu cum Collegis plurimis habito, susceptus est Trophimus; pro quo satisfaciebat fratrum Reditus, & restituta multorum Salus: Sic tamen admissus est Trophimus, ut Laicus communice-  
ret, non secundum quod ad te malignorum Literæ pertulerunt, quasi locum sacerdotis usurpet. *Cyprian*, in the same Epist. p. 104. reflects upon *Novatian* for using Force to get himself Or-  
dained: Vim fecit, ut Episcopus fieret.



of his Ordainers was, for his Crime, Degraded and made a Layman; and the other two not allowed so much as the Privilege of Communicating Laymen, but were wholly Excommunicated and cast out of the Church, we cannot suppose, that *Novatian*, who was the Cause of all this, could have the least pretence to a true Ordination, nor consequently any Authority, as from Heaven or the Church, to act as a Bishop, and give others Ordination. For not only *Cornelius* and *Cyprian*, who might be supposed to be Parties against *Novatian*, but all the ancient Canons, declare such sort of Simoniacal, Irregular, and Forced Ordinations, to be Void and Null from the beginning. Which are things, I presume, so well known<sup>1</sup>, that I need not insist upon them.

But there was another Reason which utterly annulled the Ordination of *Novatian*, and made him no true Bishop; and that was, that, against all the Laws of the Catholick Church, and Rules of Catholick Unity, he intruded himself into a full See, where another was Regularly and Divinely chosen before him. This is the Argument so much insisted on by *Cyprian* in particular, to prove him no true Bishop. Thus in the forecited Epistle to *Antonian*, speaking of the Difference between the Ordinations of *Cornelius* and *Novatian*, he freely, after this manner, gives his Judgment, of them

H both :

§. 4.

*This proved farther, because he intruded himself into a full See.*

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Can. Apost. c. 29. & Concil. Chalced. can. 2.



both: “*Cornelius*, says he, was made Bishop  
 “ by the Approbation<sup>m</sup> and Judgment of GOD  
 “ and CHRIST; by the Testimony of almost  
 “ all the Clergy, and the Suffrage of all the  
 “ People that were present, and the College of  
 “ Ancient and Good Bishops; when no one had  
 “ been Ordained before him, when the Place  
 “ of *Fabian*, that is, when the Place of *Peter*,  
 “ and the Episcopal Chair was empty. Which  
 “ being once filled according to the Will of  
 “ GOD, and confirmed by all our Consent and  
 “ Approbation; whoever after that is minded  
 “ to be made Bishop, is a Foreigner and an A-  
 “ lien; he has not the Ordination of the  
 “ Church, who holds not the Unity of the  
 “ Church; whoever he be, or whatever he  
 “ boasts, or assumes to himself, he is a Propha-  
 “ ner, an Alien, a Foreigner. There cannot  
 “ be a second Bishop after the first: Therefore  
 “ whoever is made a Bishop after the first, which  
 “ ought to be singly done, he is not a second  
 “ Bishop, but none at all.” It is impossible to  
 express in plainer Words, that *Novatian* was not  
 a true Bishop, tho’ he had three Bishops to give  
 him

<sup>m</sup> *Cypr. Ep. 52. al. 55. ad Anton. p. 104.* Factus est *Corne-  
 lius* Episcopus de Dei & Christi ejus judicio, de Clericorum  
 pene omnium testimonio, &c. cum nemo ante se factus esset,  
 cum *Fabiani* locus, id est, cum locus *Petri*, & gradus *Cathe-  
 dræ* sacerdotalis vacaret. Quo occupato de Dei voluntate,  
 atque omnium nostrum Consensione firmato; quisquis jam  
 Episcopus fieri voluerit, foris fiat necesse est; nec habeat  
 Ecclesiasticam Ordinationem, qui Ecclesiæ non tenet Unitate-  
 tem; quisquis ille fuerit, multum de se licet jactans, & sibi  
 plurimum vindicans, profanus est, alienus est, foris est. Et  
 cum post primum secundus esse non possit, quisquis post  
 unum, qui solus esse debet, factus est, non jam secundus ille,  
 sed nullus est.



him a Theatrical and Delusory Ordination, *Cyprian* a little after, in the same Epistle, joins both these Arguments together, to prove him to be no Bishop, because he was Simoniacally Ordained, and because<sup>n</sup> he was an Adulterous and Extraneous Bishop, made after another had been Ordained in the Church by Sixteen Fellow-Bishops: And therefore he charges him with setting up an Humane Church, instead of a Divine, and sending new Apostles into every City, to maintain the Foundations of his new Institution: In short, all these were False Bishops, because they were Super-ordained (by one who himself had no Power) over other Bishops that had before been Regularly Ordained in every City and Province, and who both for their Age and Faith, and Fortitude in Sufferings and Persecution, were without Exception. *Cyprian* often repeats and inculcates this Argument in his other Epistles, that there could not<sup>o</sup> be another Bishop after the first was Legally made; that he was an Adulterous Bishop<sup>p</sup> and a contrary Head, not in the Church, but out of it,

H 2 since

---

<sup>n</sup> *Ibid.* p. 112. Nisi Episcopus tibi videtur, qui Episcopo in Ecclesia à sedecim Coepiscopis facto, adulter atque extraneus Episcopus fieri à Desertoribus per Ambitum nititur; ----- Et humanam conetur Ecclesiam facere, & per plurimas Civitates novos Apostolos suos mittat. ----- Cumque jampridem per omnes Provincias & per Urbes singulas ordinati sint Episcopi in ætate antiqui, in Fide integri, in pressura probati, in Persecutione proscripti, ille super eos creare alios Pseudoepiscopos audeat.

<sup>o</sup> *Cypr. Ep.* 41. al. 44. ad *Cornel.* p. 86. Episcopo semel facto, & Collegarum ac Plebis testimonio & judicio comprobato, alium constitui nullo modo posse.

<sup>p</sup> *Id.* Ep. 42. al. 45. ad *Cornel.* p. 86. Contra Sacramentum semel traditum divinæ Dispositionis & Catholicæ Unitatis, adulterum & contrarium Caput extra Ecclesiam fecit.



since he was Ordained against the Rule of the Divine Institution and Catholick Unity, only by the Prevalency of a Faction. With much more to the same <sup>q</sup> purpose, which, after such plain Testimonies, I need not cite at length to satisfy a judicious Reader. But, that this may not seem to be the Private Opinion only of *Cyprian* or *Cornelius*, as Persons who wrote out of Prejudice to *Novatian*, I will shew it to be agreeable to the General and Standing Rule of the Catholick Church, that a Man is no Bishop, who is Superordained over another Bishop, into a full See, which the other is Legally and Divinely possess of. This was the Ground upon which the Council of *Aquileia* <sup>r</sup> pronounced *Valens* the *Arian* to be no Bishop, because he was Superordained at *Petavio*, while *Marcus* the true Bishop was living. Upon this Ground the Ordination of *Majorinus* the first Father of the *Donatists* was reckoned Null, because he was Superordained a Pretended Bishop at *Carthage*, when the See was Legally filled before by *Cæcilian*. For this made the Schism, and set up Altar against Altar, and therefore the Ordination of *Majorinus* <sup>f</sup> was Unlawful, as *Optatus* words it. This was one Reason why the Council of *Nice* disannulled the Ordinations of those Bishops, whom *Meletius* had Schismatically Superordained in *Egypt*, when the Sees were filled with Catho-  
lick

<sup>q</sup> Vid. *Cypr. Ep.* 44. al. 46. ad *Maxim. & Nicost. p.* 89. *Ep.* 67. al. 68. ad *Lucium. p.* 177.

<sup>r</sup> *Conc. Aquilei. Epist. Synod. ad Gratian. & Theodos. Conc. Tom. 2. p.* 995. Qui *Episcopus esse nec coepit. Nam primo Petavione superpositus fuerat Sancto viro Marco admirabilis memoriae Sacerdos. al. Sacerdoti.*

<sup>f</sup> *Optat. Lib. 1. p.* 42. Sic exitum est foras, & altare contra altare erectum est, & Ordinatio illicite celebrata est.



lick Bishops before : This he did to strengthen his Party, but the Council Decreed all these should be Reordained before they were admitted to serve in the Catholick Church, as we have heard before in the History of that Council. The next General Council of *Constantinople*, upon the same Ground, declared *Maximus* the Cynick to be no Bishop (tho' he had Seven Bishops to Ordain him) because his Ordination was only a Superordination into a full See, of which *Gregory Nazianzen* was legally possessed before : And they not only annulled his Ordination, but all those that were Ordained by him, as I have shewed in the last Chapter, from the fifth Canon of that Council. For the same Reason all the Bishops in the World, who defended the Council of *Chalcedon*, declared unanimously in their Answers to *Leo* the Emperor, upon the Case of *Timotheus Alerus* the pretended Bishop of *Alexandria*, who had gotten himself first Superordained into the See of *Proterius*, and shortly after, by his Faction Murdered him ; they declared, I say, this *Timotheus* not only to be no Bishop<sup>t</sup>, but to be deprived of the Name of a Christian, as *Liberatus* informs us from the Synodical Epistles, that were then, from several Parts of the World, sent to the Emperor upon it. Some of these are yet remaining at the end of the Acts of the Council of *Chalcedon*, one or two of which it will not be amiss here to transcribe. In the Synodical Epistle of the Bishops of *Phœnicia Secunda* to the Emperor, they thus

H 3                      express

<sup>t</sup> *Liberat. Breviar. c. 15.* Rescribunt, Timotheum non solum inter Episcopos non haberi, sed etiam Christiana appellatione privari.



express themselves <sup>v</sup> concerning this *Timotheus*, That he was a Wicked Tyrant, and by no means ever made a Bishop, but was only an Adulterous Invader of the Church; one who, by the Blood of the true Bishop, was minded to settle himself in the Church which CHRIST Redeemed with his own Blood; one that was no Shepherd of CHRIST's Flock, but an Insupportable Wolf; not a Father, but a Parricide or Murderer of his Father, meaning the true Bishop; Not a Bridegroom, but an Usurper of the Marriage-Chamber. Such an one, they declare, they could not call a Bishop. In another of these Synodical Epistles <sup>w</sup> from the Bishops of *Helenopontus* (which the Printed Copies read corruptly, *Hellespontus*) a great many Reasons are given why the Ordination of this *Timotheus* never made him a true Bishop; because he was in the first place, actually Deposed from the Office of Presbyter, by his own Bishop *Proterius*, and an Egyptian

<sup>v</sup> *Epist. Synod. Phœnicie secundæ ad Leon. Imp. ad Calcem Conc. Chalced. Par. 3. cap. 38. Con. Tom. 4. p. 922. De impia vero Tyrannide Timothei Ægyptii, qua usus est, sacerdos equidem factus non est, sed potius Ecclesiæ Adulter apparuit. Quid dicam, qui eam quam salvator proprio sanguine liberavit, ille Pontificali sanguine voluit adipisci; & factus est non Pastor ovium Christi, sed importabilis Lupus; non Pater, sed Parricida; non sponsus, sed thalami violator. ----- Nequaquam nos vocamus Sacerdotem.*

<sup>w</sup> *Ibid. cap. 53. Neque is qui ab eis ordinatus est, sacerdotium poterit obtinere, vel si regulariter provenisset, quando etiam is qui dicitur ordinatus, damnatus erat à sanctissimæ memoriæ Episcopo suo Proterio, & Concilio sanctorum Episcoporum Ægyptiacæ Diœceseos, quique à duobus solummodo similiter secum condemnatis, & neque numerum ordinantium complentibus regularem, nefandam Ordinationem dicitur suscepisse, vivo Pontifice, & ea quæ sunt sacerdotii celebrante.*



*Egyptian* Synod; then again he had but two Bishops to Ordain him, which was not a Canonical number; and farther these two were under the same Sentence of Deposition with himself; and lastly, this wicked Ordination was made while *Proterius* the true Bishop was living, and actually performing the Duties of the Episcopal Function. Such Intruders as these therefore were only Wolves or Adulterers, and not true Shepherds or Bishops, in the Language of the ancient Councils. Some Councils <sup>x</sup> peremptorily forbid all such Superordinations, or Superposition of one Bishop over another, except it be in the Place of one who is legally deposed for some Capital Crime. And other Councils declare <sup>y</sup> all such Superordained Usurpers to be Wolves, and not Bishops; no nor to deserve the Name of Bishops, as the great Council of *Sardica* speaks in this behalf, concerning *Gregory*, who was intruded into *Alexandria*, in the room of *Athanasius*; and *Basil* of *Ancyra*, in the room of *Marcellus*; and *Quintianus* of *Gaza*, in the place of *Asclepius*. So that it is as evident as Words or Authorities can make it, that according to the Rules and Discipline of the ancient Church, not only in the *Cyprianick* Age, but in the following Ages also, the Ordination of a Man into a full See, legally possess'd and occupied

H 4

<sup>x</sup> *Conc. Aurelian* 5. can. 12. Nulli viventi Episcopo alius Superponatur aut Superordinetur Episcopus, nisi forsitan in ejus locum quem Capitalis culpa dejecerit.

<sup>y</sup> *Conc. Sardic. Ep. Synodica*, ap. *Hilar. in Fragmentis*, p. 128. Illos autem qui se eorum Ecclesiis immerferunt luporum more, id est, *Gregorium* in *Alexandria*, *Basilium* in *Ancyra* & *Quintianum* in *Gaza*, neque nomen habere Episcopi, neque communionis omnino eorum habere participatum.

*Vid. Theod. Hist. Lib. 2. c. 8. & Athanas. Apol. 2.*



pied by another, was a null Ordination from the beginning; and such an one was not a Bishop, but an Unauthorized Intruder, a Wolf, an Adulterer, an Alien and Foreigner, and no Priest in the Eye of the Catholick Church. Whence it follows, that *Novatian* being one of this sort, had no Pretence to the Name or Authority of a Bishop; and consequently all such as were Ordained by him, either Bishops or Priests, to strengthen his Faction, were in no better Condition: For they could have no more Authority than they derived from him, which was really none at all, if there be any Weight in the Account that has now been given of his Ordination. And yet the Baptisms of these *Novatians* were by Order of several General Councils received, as given in due Form, in the Name of the Trinity, tho' by Persons who, upon many Accounts, had no Ministerial Authority to give them. I hope now my Learned Friend Dr. Brett will own this is home to the Point, That the Church received the Baptisms of such Hereticks as administred it in due Form, tho' they never had a Real, but only a Pretended Ordination. If he asks, Why then the Council of *Nice* did not order the *Novatian* Bishops and Priests to be Reordained? I answer, Some Learned Men think she did make such an Order in her eighth Canon, which appoints them to be received among the Catholick Clergy by Imposition of Hands, *Χειροθετούμενος αὐτὸς μένειν ἕως ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ*. But I am not sure that Imposition of Hands, in that place, means the Imposition used in Ordination. If the Doctor thinks it does, he has his Answer. But one thing I am sure of, that without a Reconciliatory Imposition of Hands to unite them to the Church, the *Novatians* had no



no Authority to act as Lawful Ministers of the Church; And whether the Church gave them a new Ordination or not, she certainly gave them the Authority of a new Commission, which they had not, nor could have before, whilst they were involved in such a Schism, as could afford them no Real, but only Pretended Ordinations. But forasmuch as the outward Form of Ordination was given them in Presence, tho' without any competent Authority in the Ordainers, the Church perhaps might have her Reasons to omit the outward Ceremony, and supply what was deficient in their Ordination, by adding her own Authentick Commission and Authority upon their Reconciliation to the Church. But whether it was one way or other, we are assured in Fact, they were never truly and authentically Ordained in their Schism, because they had no Real, but only a Pretended Ordination, given them by Persons who, by the Rules of the Church, had no Authority to give it.

C H A P.



## C H A P. III.

*Argum. 2. That Hereticks are not Authorized Ministers of GOD, because when they fall into open and profest Heresy, they cease to be true Christian Priests, and become Wolves and Antichrists, instead of true Shepherds and Governours of the Flock of CHRIST.*

S. I.

*That a Lawful Ordination does not secure a Man in the Possession of a perpetual Authorized Priesthood, unless he observe the Rules of the Priesthood.*

**H**AVING thus far shewed, that some Hereticks were not true Authoritative Ministers of GOD, because they never had a just and proper Call or Ordination to the Priesthood: I will now, to gratify my Learned Adversaries Hypothesis, suppose with them (not granting it) that all the ancient Hereticks had had a true and lawful Ordination: Yet I assert, that it does not hence follow, that they were true Authorized Priests of GOD. For the Priests of GOD are bound to walk by certain Rules, which are necessary to preserve their Authority; and unless they observe those Rules, they forfeit their Authority; and it is not meerly the Privilege of a Lawful Ordination that can secure them in the perpetual Possession of an Authorized Priesthood, if they do such things as Unqualify them for the Ministry of the Gospel. There are, it may be, near an Hundred several Crimes, specified in those ancient



ent Canons, to which I have referred the Reader in the beginning of the last Chapter, for which a Priest who had received a Lawful Ordination, might be finally Degraded and Deposed, and thereby forfeit all the Right and Title he could pretend to have, to act with Authority in any part of the Ministerial Function. And among these Crimes, Heresy was always reckon'd the chief, because it struck at the very Foundation of Religion; that is to say, the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints. Therefore a Priest once plainly convict of open and profest Heresy, was no longer deemed a true and lawful Priest, or allowed to act with the Authority of a Minister in the Church. The very People were bound in Conscience to fly from such for their own Security: For they were Wolves, and not Shepherds; Antichrists, and not true Ministers of CHRIST.

A Man cannot look into the Writings of St. Cyprian, but he will see this almost in every Page of him: For he always opposes the Priests of God, and Hereticks, as Dia-

§. 2.

*This proved from Cyprian, who declares Hereticks to forfeit both the Name and Authority of Priests.*

metrically contrary to one another; stiling the latter Adulterers, Impious, Sacrilegious Usurpers, who set up a Priesthood only of humane Invention, contrary to the Divine and Evangelical Institution; and assumed to themselves such Powers, as did by no Right belong to them. Thus, in one of his Epistles <sup>a</sup> to his People at Carthage,

<sup>a</sup> Cypr. Ep. 40. al. 43. ad Pleb. p. 82. Relictis Domini Sacerdotibus contra Evangelicam Disciplinam nova traditio Sacrilegæ Institutionis exsurgit.



*Carthage*, he complains of the Five Schismaticks who joined with *Felicissimus*, that they left the Priests of the Lord, and set up a new Sacrilegious Institution against the Discipline of the Gospel. A little after he says, "There was but  
 " one Church, and one Chair, founded by  
 " CHRIST himself in the Person of *Peter*. And  
 " another Altar <sup>b</sup> could not be erected, nor a  
 " new Priesthood invented, beside the one Altar  
 " and the one Priesthood that was already settled. Whosoever gathers elsewhere, he scatters abroad. Whatever Priesthood is set up  
 " by humane Fury, to the violation of the Divine Institution, is Adulterous, Impious, Sacrilegious. Therefore depart from the Contagion of these Men, and avoid their Preaching as a Cancer and a Plague." Could he that said thus much of Schismaticks, think Hereticks to be Priests of God, who are so much worse than Schismaticks, by how much they strike more directly at the Foundation? Tho' they were regularly Ordained at first, yet, according to *Cyprian*, their Heresy or Schism destroys their Title, and their Succession becomes only an Humane Institution, which cannot make Priests without God's appointing. Therefore he calls all such as are Ordained <sup>c</sup> by Hereticks, False Bishops, and False Priests; Adversaries

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.* p. 83. Una Ecclesia & Cathedra una super Petrum Domini voce fundata. Aliud altare constitui, aut Sacerdotium novum fieri, præter unum altare & unum Sacerdotium non potest. Quisquis alibi collegerit, spargit. Adulterum est, impium est, Sacrilegum est, quodcunque humano furore instituitur, ut Dispositio Divina violetur. Procul ab hujusmodi hominum contagione discedite, &c.

<sup>c</sup> *Cypr. Ep.* 55. *al.* 59. *ad Cornel.* p. 132. Fortunatum Pseudoepiscopum -- Felicem in Hæresi Pseudoepiscopum constitutum.



series of the Lord and Antichrists <sup>d</sup>; Rebels and Enemies, for receding from Charity and the Unity of the Church; and worse than Heathens and Publicans, for setting up false Altars, and illegal Priesthoods, and sacrilegious Sacrifices, and adulterated Names. In short, He denies all such to be Priests; they are the Enemies <sup>e</sup> of Priests; they only usurp other Mens Offices, which by no Right belong to them. Therefore the Council of *Carthage*, under *Cyprian*, determined, that all such pretended Priests <sup>f</sup> lost what they received before, by vertue of a Legal Ordination; and that all such as were Ordained by them, upon their return to the Church, were only to be received as Laymen <sup>g</sup>. I know my Opponents will not pretend to deny this to have been the Opinion of *Cyprian* and the whole Council of *Carthage*. Nay, they will readily join *Firmilian* and *St. Basil* to them. For they know *St. Basil* says, *Cyprian* and *Firmilian* pleaded for the Rebaptization of such as were Baptized by Hereticks and Schismaticks upon this Principle, That Hereticks were not Priests, and therefore had no Authority to Baptize, or Ordain, or Absolve, or perform any other Office of the Sacer-

<sup>d</sup> *Cypr. Ep. 76. al. 69. ad Magnum. p. 180.* Apparet adversarios Domini, & Antichristos omnes esse, quos constet à Caritate atque ab unitate Ecclesiæ recessisse. ---- Si qui Ecclesiam contemnunt, Ethnici & Publicani habentur; multo magis utique Rebelles & Hostes, falsa altaria, & illicita Sacerdotia, & Sacrificia Sacrilega, & nomina adulterata fingentes, inter Ethnicos & Publicanos necesse est computentur, &c.

<sup>e</sup> *Ibid. p. 184.* Hostes Sacerdotum, aliena & illicita, & nullo sibi jure concessa, usurpare conantur.

<sup>f</sup> *Conc. Carthag. ap. Cypr. num. 70.* Schismaticus quod habuit amisit.

<sup>g</sup> *Ibid. n. 4. p. 231.* Eos qui ordinati videbantur, inter Laicos recipi.



Sacerdotal Function. They could not then think, there was any such Vertue in the Indelible Character of a Priest, as to preserve his Sacerdotal Authority entire in him, after he was turned Heretick or Schismatick, or was Legally Degraded by the Church. Thus far therefore we seem to be agreed. But then they will say, if *Cyprian's* Principle was true, why should not his Consequences be received also; That those who are Baptized by Hereticks, and those who are Baptized by Laymen (both which are Priests of the same Authority, that is, none at all) should be Rebaptized? I answer, Because Wiser Judges than either they, or I, or even *Cyprian* himself, that is, the General Councils and Fathers of the Catholick Church, have determined otherwise. And therefore our Question at present, is not, Whether Hereticks were to be Rebaptized: (For that is determined already beyond Contradiction: ) But only, Whether Hereticks acted with the true Authority of Priests, when they baptized others, in the Opinion of *Cyprian* and the Catholick Church? That they did not act as true Authorized Priests, in the Opinion of *Cyprian*, is already cleared, and granted by my Opponents also. So that all I have now to do, is to shew the same of the Fathers and Councils of the Church in after Ages.

§. 3.  
From the Council of  
Aquileia under St.  
Ambrose.

And here we have the Testimony of St. *Ambrose* and a whole Council of Italian Bishops, who met at *Aquileia* to Depose *Palladius* and *Secundianus* two *Arian* Bishops, An. 381. the same Year that the *Macedonians*, and *Apollinarians*, and *Maximus* the Cynick, were Deposed in the General Council



Council of *Constantinople*. Now this Council, in their Synodical Epistle to the Emperors *Valentinian* and *Gratian*, acquainting them with their Proceedings against those *Arian* Bishops, tell them they had Abdicated them from the Priesthood: For it was not <sup>h</sup> fit that they should lay any claim to be Priests under him, whose Divinity they had denied. In the Acts of the Synod every Bishop pronounces his particular Sentence against them. St. *Ambrose* and *Valerian* in these Words, I judge <sup>i</sup> *Palladius* an Alien from the College or Society of Priests. *Justus* in these words: I think *Palladius* can no longer <sup>k</sup> be called a Priest nor be reckoned among Bishops. *Felix* of *Fadera*: I judge him by no means to be either a Priest <sup>l</sup> or a Christian. These Bishops had not such an Opinion of the Indelible Character of a Priest, whatever there may be in it, as to think that an *Arian* Heretick had any longer the Authority of a Priest of CHRIST, whose Divinity he denied: But they thought he might be Abdicated from the Priesthood, and therefore they deprived him of it, that he might no longer, under the name of a Priest, deceive the People.

About

<sup>h</sup> *Conc. Aquilei. Ep. Synod. Conc. Tom. 2. 989.* Ne ulterius populos deciperent, Sacerdotio putamus abdicandos. Neque enim dignum est, ut Sacerdotium ejus sibi vendicent, quem negaverunt.

<sup>i</sup> *Sentent. Ambros. ibid.* A Consortio Sacerdotum censeo esse alienum.

<sup>k</sup> *Sentent. Just. ibid.* Censeo ulterius Sacerdotem dici non posse, nec inter Episcopos deputari.

<sup>l</sup> *Felix. ibid.* Nec Christianum hunc, nec Sacerdotem ullo modo censemus.



S. 4.  
From the Council  
of Colonia Agrippi-  
na.

About the Year 346, another Council was held at *Colonia Agrippina*, by the famous *Servatius Tungrensis*, and several other Bishops, against *Euphratas*, Bishop of *Colen*, whom they likewise Deposed for maintaining the *Arian* Heresy. The Form of his Deposition runs much in the same Terms, as in the Council of *Aquileia*. *Maximinus Treverensis*, who presided in the Council, declares it manifest<sup>m</sup> that he cannot be a Bishop. Others say, He is legally Deposed from his Episcopacy by the Rules of the Gospel. *Servatius* speaks more expressly, "That he cannot be a Christian Bishop, who with a Sacrilegious Mouth, denies CHRIST to be GOD." *Valentinus* Bishop of *Arles* said, he could be no Bishop, who, for denying CHRIST to be GOD, had not so much as Right to Lay-Communion. The same is said in the Acts of *Servatius*, which are added by *Crab* at the end of the Acts of this Synod: That it was his Opinion, that if this *Euphratas*<sup>n</sup> was allowed to do Penance, it should not be as a Bishop, but rather as a Layman. To which all  
the

---

<sup>m</sup> in *Conc. Agrippin.* p. 217. ap. *Crab. Tom. 1.* Episcopum eum, manifestum est, esse non posse. *Valentinus* Episcopus dixit, Quia *Euphrata* Christum Deum negat, consentio eum Episcopum esse non posse, qui nec Laicam debet Communionem accipere. ----- *Severinus* dixit, Consentio eundem juxta evangelica præcepta jure ab Episcopatu esse dejectum. ---- *Servatius* dixit, Censeo eum Christianis Episcopum esse non posse, &c.

<sup>n</sup> *Acta Servatii*, ap. *Crab* ibid p. 318. Cujus & Pœnitentia si qua est expectanda, potius hanc sentio inter Laicos, quam inter Episcopos agendam. Nulla mora, singulis Pontificibus orationes similes ad eandem normam dictantibus, *Euphrata* deordinatur.



the rest of the Bishops consenting, immediately thereupon *Euphratas*, in their Stile, is said to be Unordained, or to have his Ordination cancelled; which appears to be done by Degrading him to the Order of Laymen.

Such another Sentence was passed upon the *Apollinarian* Hereticks, in an *Italick* Council under St. *Ambrose*; An. 381. §. 5.  
From an Italick  
Council, under St.  
Ambrose, An. 381. Whether this was the forementioned Council of *Aquileia*, or *Milain*, or some other, is not certain: For all that *Labbe* could find of it, is only two Synodical Epistles to *Theodosius* the Emperor; in the first of which there is this Decree mentioned, as made against the *Apollinarians* in that Council: "That if any Priest was convict of that new Heresy, he should lose ° both the Office and Name of a Priest, as having lost that which makes Priests, that is, the Magistrery of Catholick Doctrine." What can be plainer than the Evidence given in these Councils against Hereticks having any pretence to Sacerdotal Authority after their Deposition? They may be less than Laymen; for they may be Anathematized and cast out of the Church: But more than Laymen they cannot be, altho' they repent and be restored to the Communion of the Church, so long as they are divested both of the Name and Office of Priests, which was the usual Punishment of Hereticks, according to the Sentence and Decrees of these ancient Councils. I Such

o *Conc. Italic. Ep. i. ad Theod. Conc. Tom. 2. p. 1006.* Ut convictus in dogmate novo ---- illico, quod doctrinae Magisterio non teneret, & Officium deponeret, & Vocabulum Sacerdotis.



## §. 6.

From the Roman  
Council of 90 Bishops  
under Damasus, An.  
369.

Such another Council was held under *Damasus* at *Rome*, Anno 369. where Ninety Bishops met to condemn *Auxentius* and other *Arian* Bishops. In their Synodical Epistle to the Bishops of *Illyricum*, which is both in *Theodoret* and *Sozomen*, and the *Tomes* of the Councils, p they threaten to deprive them both of their Communion and the very Name of Bishops. Which certainly implies, that they thought they had Power to take away the Authority of Priests from them, since they would not leave them so much as the very Name remaining.

## §. 7.

From the Testimony  
of *Domnus*, Bishop of  
*Antioch*, and *John*  
*Cassian*.

And as they thus treated Hereticks, so did they also Catholick Priests, who committed Crimes worthy of Deposition, if they continued obstinate in them. Thus *Liberatus* observes concerning the Proceedings of *Domnus*, Bishop of *Antioch*, with the Presbyters and Deacons of *Edessa*, who came to accuse *Ibas* their Bishop before him. *Ibas* had Excommunicated them for pretending to make Information against him. From this unjust Excommunication *Domnus* the Patriarch ordered them to be Absolved; but yet upon this Condition, That if they stirred a Foot

p *Conc. Rom. Ep. Synod. Conc. Tom. 2. p. 889. Pro certo credimus, eos propter suum conatum brevi fore à nostra Communione segregatos, & nomine Episcoporum privatos. Vid. Theodor. Lib. 2. c. 22. & Sozom. Lib. 6. c. 27.*



a Foot <sup>q</sup> out of *Antioch* before the Festival of Ascension, which was then at hand, they should be Deposed from their Orders. It seems this Patriarch had no other Notion of the Orders of a Priest or Deacon, but that if they did things unworthy of their Order, they might have their Orders taken from them; and it was not the pretence of an Indelible Character could secure the Authority or Name of Priests to them, against the Authority of their Patriarch, who presumed he had a Legal Power to Depose them from their Orders. And that this was the standing Rule of the Church of *Antioch*, is farther evident from what *Cassian* says upon occasion of *Nestorius's* turning Heretick. *Nestorius* was Born, and Bred, and Baptized, and Ordained at *Antioch*; and it was the Profession of his Faith, according to the *Antiochian* Creed, which made him both a Christian and a Priest: But when he once had lost this Faith, *Cassian* <sup>r</sup> says, he then lost all that he gained by his Faith: For the Sacrament or Mystery of his Priesthood, and his Salvation too, depended both equally upon the Truth of his Creed. So that he forfeited his Priesthood, as much as he did his Salvation, when he turned Heretick, and Apostatized from the Faith in which he had been baptized.

I 2

In

<sup>q</sup> *Liberat. Breviar. cap. 10.* Qui cum ascendissent Antiochiam, Ibas eos excommunicavit. Sed superveniente Festivitate Quadragesimæ Ascensionis, jussi sunt à Domino Excommunicatione absolvi, sub ea Conditione, ut Antiochiam non exirent, alioquin à suo deponerentur Ordine.

<sup>r</sup> *Cassian. de Incarnat. Lib. 6. p. 1274.* Perdens symboli fidem, totum quod fueras perdidisti: Sacramenta enim Sacerdotii, ac salutis tuæ, symboli veritate constabant.



§. 8. In the Church of *Rome* they never received any one as a Priest who was brought to do Publick Penance: And for this Reason, Those that were Ordained by Hereticks were reckoned no Priests among them, to the Time of Pope *Innocent*, who says, "Where Penance was necessary, as it was in receiving such as were Ordained by Hereticks, there the Honour of Ordination could have no place." But, on the contrary, they maintained, that he that had lost his Honour, could not give the Honour of the Priesthood; nor could one Ordained by Hereticks receive any thing, because the Giver had nothing in him to give. Therefore it was the Custom of the *Roman* Church, to receive those that came over from Hereticks only to Lay-Communion by Imposition of Hands, but not to allow them the least Honour of the Clergy<sup>t</sup>. For tho' this was dispensed with in some extraordinary Cases of Necessity, in some other Churches, yet he says it never prevailed at *Rome*. Whence it is evident, they thought that neither they that Lapsed into Heresy, nor they that were Ordained by Hereticks, had any Title to the Honour of the Priesthood.

*Simpli-*

¶ *Innoc. Ep. 22. ad Episc. Macedon. c. 3.* Ubi Pœnitentiz remedium necessarium est, illic Ordinationis honorem locum non posse habere. --- Sed è contrario asseritur, eum qui honorem amisit, honorem dare non posse; nec illum aliquid accepisse, quia nihil in dante erat, quod ille posset accipere.

¶ *Ibid. c. 4.* Nostræ Lex Ecclesiæ est, venientibus ab Hæreticis, qui tamen illic baptizati sunt, per manus Impositionem Laicam tantum tribuere Communionem, nec ex his aliquem in Clericatus honorem vel exiguum subrogare.



*Simplicius*, Bishop of Rome, §. 9. And Pope *Simplicius*, had the same Opinion of Delinquent Clerks, that they might lose the Authority of the Priesthood: For writing to *John* Bishop of *Ravenna*, who had Ordained some Clerks against their Will, he tells him, "That for this<sup>v</sup> he deserved to lose his Privilege, for abusing the Power that was committed to him. And if he persisted Contumacious in this Practice, the Power of Ordination should be wholly taken from him." In another Epistle<sup>w</sup> to *Florentius*, *Equitius*, and *Severus*, three Italian Bishops, he has occasion to censure one *Gaudentius*, Bishop of *Ausinium*, for Ordaining against the Canons, for which Crime he declares him deprived of all Power of Ordaining for the future, and those that were Ordained illegally by him, to be Deposed. Could it then be said, that these Bishops had still Authority to Ordain, when all Power and Authority of Ordaining was wholly taken from them? Or that those Priests who were illegally Ordained by them, were true Authorized Priests, that were Deposed as soon as they were Ordained, and never allowed to exercise any part of the

I 3

<sup>v</sup> *Simplic. Ep. 2. ad Joh. Raven.* Privilegium meretur amittere, qui permessa sibi abutitur Potestate. ----- Denunciamus autem, quod si posthac quicquam tale præsumpseris, & aliquem seu Episcopum seu Presbyterum seu Diaconum invitum facere forte credideris, Ordinationis tibi Ravennatis Ecclesiæ vel Æmiliensis noveris auferendas.

<sup>w</sup> *Id. Ep. 3. ad Florent. ap. Crab. Tom. 1. p. 957.* Relatio nos instruit, Gaudentium Ausiniensis Ecclesiæ Sacerdotem, contra Statuta Canonum ac nostra præcepta, Ordinationes illicitas perpetrasse, quarum illi totam penitus auferri præcipimus Potestatem. ----- Et hi qui illicite ab eodem sunt provecti, ab Ecclesiasticis Ministeriis sint remoti.



the Ministerial Function? We see no difference here made between those that once had a true Ordination, and those that had not: For when they were once totally Deposed, they were all equally deprived of the Power and Authority of the Priesthood.

§. 10.  
And Pope Vigilius.

Pope *Vigilius* is as peremptory as his Predecessors, that a Synod of Bishops has Power to take away all Ministerial Office and Power from a Delinquent Bishop or Clerk: And by vertue hereof he himself, with a Synod of Bishops, deprived *Theodore*, Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia*, delaring him divested and despoiled, as well of Sacerdotal<sup>x</sup> Honour and Catholick Communion, as of all Episcopal Office and Power; and that henceforth he had nothing to do but to weep out his Sins by Repentance. They that made Canons in this Stile against Hereticks and other Criminal Clerks, could not possibly think they were Authorized Priests, after such Legal and Formal Depositions, which took from them both the Office and the Name, and the Power and Authority of the Priesthood. But it will still be said, over and over again, by those against whom I dispute, that these were not meer Laymen: By which if they mean, Men that never had any sort of Ordination at all, either Real or Pretended, I grant they were not, nor could be meer Laymen: For it were an absurd Contradiction to say, that they had received

---

<sup>x</sup> *Fragment. Depositionis Theodori per Vigil. ap. Crab. Tom. 2. p. 8. Theodorum tam Sacerdotali honore & Communione Catholica, quam vel omni Officio Episcopali seu Potestate spoliatum esse decernimus, &c.*



received an Ordination, and yet never had one. But the thing I assert is this, that a Man who had a true Ordination, if for Heresy or any other Crime he was legally Deposed, he had no longer the Divine Power of an Authorized Priest; because the same Divine Authority which gave him his Authority by Ordination, by Deordination takes it away from him; and save that it cannot be said he never had an Ordination, in all other Respects he was a Layman, and all his pretended Ministerial Offices were of no more Authority or Effect, than those of a Layman, because he was wholly divested of all Clerical Authority; and either reduced to the State and Communion of Laymen, if Penitent; or else, if he remained Contumacious and Impenitent, he was set one Degree below Laymen, that is, totally Excommunicated and cast out of the Church. Of which Points of Discipline, toward Hereticks and Delinquent Clerks in the ancient Church, I have given some Hints already, and shall now more fully demonstrate the Truth of them in the two following Chapters.



## C H A P. IV.

*Argum. 3. That Hereticks, and Degraded Clerks, were not Authorized Priests in the Account of the Ancient Church, because, by her Discipline, they were reduced to the State and Communion of Laymen.*

*S. 1.*  
*No Persons who were obliged to do Publick Penance, allowed to be of the Clergy.*

**A**S a farther Proof of the Position at first laid down, That Hereticks and Degraded Clerks could not act with the Authority of Priests, but only as Laicks, in the Ministration of Baptism or any other Sacred Office, I here observe, that by the Censures of the Church, they were reduced to the State, and Name, and Communion of Laymen. And this upon Supposition only that they were Penitent, and submitted to the Churches Discipline: For otherwise they were Anathematized with the greater Excommunication, and not allowed the Benefit even of Lay-Communion in the Church. Lay-Communion then was a Privilege allowed to Hereticks and Degraded Clerks upon their Repentance; but more than this was not ordinarily granted them: If any Man, for any Scandalous Crimes, was obliged to do Publick Penance, this cut him off from Clerical Communion ever after, by the strict Discipline which continued for several Ages in the Church. Upon this Account, as I have



have observed and proved in another place <sup>2</sup> from many Testimonies of *Siricius*, *Innocentius*, *Gennadius*, the second Council of *Arles*, the Council of *Agde*, the first Council of *Toledo*, the fourth Council of *Carthage*, the Council of *Gerunda*, *Optatus* and *St. Austin*, if any had done Publick Penance in the Church, for any Scandalous Crime, that very thing did for ever, according to the Rules and Discipline of those Times, render that Person incapable of Holy Orders; or if he was Ordained by Mistake, as soon as the thing came to be known, he was Deposed by a Rule of the fourth Council of *Carthage*, Can. 68. for not declaring that he had been a Penitent, at the time of his Ordination. So in like manner, any Clerk, who had received a Just and Canonical Ordination, if after that he Lapsed into any Crimes that required him to do Publick Penance, as Heresy, Idolatry, Murder, Adultery, and many the like, was thereby utterly excluded from all Clerical Communion, and reduced as entirely to Lay-Communion, as any one that had at first been irregularly Ordained.

Nor was it only Publick Penitents among the Clergy that were thus treated, but likewise all others that were totally

§. 2.

*All Degraded Persons reduced, at least, to Lay-Communion.*

Degraded for any Crimes whatsoever. Though they were excused doing Publick Penance, because they thought a single Punishment of Degradation was sufficient for such Crimes; yet they were still debarred all Clerical Communion



nion, and only treated as Laymen for ever after in the Church. This is so evident to all that are acquainted with ancient History, that I would not spend time to prove it, were not the Gentlemen I am dealing with, so Rigid as to exact superabundant Proofs from Fathers and Councils for every thing I have asserted against them. Let us see then, for their Satisfaction, what Evidence there is, that Hereticks and Degraded Clerks, whether subjected to Publick Penance or not, were all reduced to the State of Lay-Communion.

S. 3.

I begin with the Testimony of Cyprian, and his Contemporaries, Cornelius Bishop of Rome, and the Fathers assembled under Cyprian in the Council of Carthage. We have had something of Cyprian's Judgment about this matter before, upon the Case<sup>b</sup> of *Trophimus*, one of the Three Bishops that Ordained *Novatian*, who, upon his Acknowledgment of his Error, was admitted into the Church again, yet not allowed to take upon him the Office of a Priest, but only to Communicate in the Quality of a Layman. And so *Cornelius*, speaking of the same Person, says, He received him<sup>d</sup> into Communion only as a Layman. Which does not mean, that he was only like a Layman, but that he was now a Layman, and not a Priest, as Cyprian more distinctly expresses it. In another

<sup>b</sup> See before, chap. 2. n. 3.

<sup>c</sup> *Cypr. Ep. 52. al. 55. ad Anton. p. 105.* Sic tamen admittitur est Trophimus, ut Laicus communicet, non quasi Locum sacerdotis usurpet.

<sup>d</sup> *Cornel. Ep. ad Fabian. ap. Euseb. Lib. 6. c. 43.* Ἐκείνους ὡς λαϊκῶν.



other Epistle, *Cyprian*, with a whole Synod of *African* Bishops, considers the Case of *Basilides* and *Martial*, two *Spanish* Bishops, who had Lapsed into Idolatry in time of Persecution: "These Men, at first, he says, Deposed<sup>e</sup> themselves voluntarily for their Crimes, and desired only to be admitted to Penance, and thought it Favour enough to be admitted to Communion as Laymen. But afterward they repented of their Repentance, and would have been admitted again as Bishops; which would by no means be allowed them: For such Men did but in vain attempt to be Bishops<sup>f</sup>, since it was a clear Case, that they ought not to Preside over the Church of CHRIST, or Offer Sacrifice to GOD: Especially when it had been so decreed, not only by the *African* Synods, but by *Cornelius* at *Rome*, and all the Bishops of the whole World, that such Men might be admitted to Penance indeed, but never more lay any Claim to the Order of the Clergy, or the Honour of the Priesthood." Here, I think, if ever, there was Universal Consent of all the Bishops in the World upon the Point in Debate: They all decreed to a Man, that a Bishop or Priest, that

<sup>e</sup> *Cypr. Ep. 68. al. 67. ad Fratr. Hispan. p. 173.* Basilides Episcopatum pro conscientiae suae vulnere sponte deponens, ad agendam poenitentiam conversus, Deum deprecatus, & satis gratulans, si sibi vel Laico communicare contingeret.

<sup>f</sup> *Cypr. ibid. p. 174.* Frustra tales Episcopatum sibi usurpare conantur, cum manifestum sit ejusmodi homines nec Ecclesiae Christi posse praeesse, nec Deo Sacrificia offerre debere. Maxime cum jampridem nobiscum & cum omnibus omnino Episcopis in toto mundo constitutis, etiam *Cornelius* Collega noster --- decreverit, ejusmodi homines ad Poenitentiam quidem agendam posse admitti; ab Ordinatione autem Cleri atque Sacerdotali Honore prohiberi.



was justly Deposed for Idolatry, was no longer an Authorized Bishop or Priest, nor to be reckoned of the Order of the Clergy, but to be treated only as Laymen. I challenge the World to give a plainer Proof of Universal Consent in this Case : And if the Opposers of the Validity of Lay-Baptism, and Defenders of Re-baptization, will produce as Authentick a Testimony of Universal Consent for their Thesis, I will promise, in point of History, to subscribe to their Opinion.

But I go on with *Cyprian*, who, in another Epistle to Pope *Stephen* 8, says, “ It was agreed  
 “ upon by common Authority and Consent,  
 “ that if any Presbyters or Deacons, who were  
 “ first Ordained in the Catholick Church, did  
 “ afterward turn Traitors and Rebels against  
 “ the Church, or any others that were promo-  
 “ ted among Hereticks, by the prophane Ordination of False Bishops and Antichrists, against  
 “ the Rule of CHRIST, did take upon them to  
 “ Offer False and Sacrilegious Sacrifice, out of  
 “ the Church, in Opposition to the one Altar of  
 “ GOD ; that neither of these, upon their Return to the Church, should be received upon  
 “ any other Condition but this, That they should  
 “ be

---

g *Cypr. Ep. 72. ad Stephan. p. 197.* Addimus plane Auctoritate communi, ut si qui Presbyteri aut Diaconi, qui vel in Ecclesia Catholica prius Ordinati fuerint, & postmodum perfidi ac rebelles contra Ecclesiam steterint; vel apud Hæreticos à Pseudoepiscopis & Antichristis contra Christi dispositionem profana ordinatione promoti sint, & contra altare unum atque Divinum, Sacrificia foris falsa ac Sacrilega offerre conati sint; eos quoque hac Conditione suscipi cum revertuntur, ut communicent Laici, & satis habeant quod admittuntur ad Pacem, qui hostes Paces extiterint; nec debere eos revertentes ea apud nos Ordinationis & Honoris arma retinere, quibus contra nos rebellaverint.



“ be Laymen, and Communicate only as such,  
 “ and account it enough to be admitted to the  
 “ Churches Peace, who had been the Enemies  
 “ of Peace, but not be allowed to retain the  
 “ Armour of their Ordination and Honour,  
 “ with which they had fought against her.” It is  
 impossible to say in plainer Words, that Here-  
 ticks and Degraded Clerks are not Priests, but  
 only Laymen; or that such as are Ordained by  
 Hereticks, who are only False Bishops and An-  
 tichrists, are only Laymen, and to be treated as  
 Laymen, upon their Return to the Church. I  
 shall but mention one place more in *Cyprian*,  
 which relates the Case of one *Fortunatianus*, an  
*African* Bishop of *Assura*, who had Lapsed either  
 into Idolatry or the *Novatian* Schism, for which  
 he was Deposed, but afterward would have acted  
 as a Bishop again; whom *Cyprian* therefore vi-  
 olently opposed, writing to the Church of *As-  
 sura*, and telling them how much he was offen-  
 ded, that *Fortunatianus* <sup>h</sup> this Quondam Bishop,  
 should, after his Fall and Ruine, attempt to be  
 restored to his Office, and Act as a Bishop a-  
 gain; and, when he ought only to give himself  
 up to Prayers and Tears, Day and Night, to  
 implore God’s Mercy, and make Satisfaction  
 for his Offence, he still presumed to lay Claim  
 to the Priesthood, which he had betrayed; as if it  
 was

<sup>h</sup> *Cypr. Ep. 64. al. 65. ad Plebem Assuritan. p. 162.* Gra-  
 viter motus sum, quod cognoverim Fortunatianum quondam  
 apud vos Episcopum, post gravem lapsum ruinæ suæ, pro  
 integro nunc agere velle, & Episcopatum sibi vindicare cœ-  
 pisse. ----- Et cum debeat satisfacere, & ad Dominum ex-  
 orandum, diebus ac noctibus, lachrymis & orationibus &  
 precibus incumbere, audet sibi adhuc sacerdotium quod pro-  
 didit vindicare; quasi post aras Diaboli accedere ad altare  
 Dei fas sit.



was Lawful for a Man to Minister at the Altar of God, who before had stood at the Altar of the Devil. This evidently goes upon the same Principle, that a Bishop, once Deposed for Idolatry or Heresy, was never after to be reputed a Bishop, or to meddle with any part of the Episcopal Office, but to do Penance for his Crimes, in order to be received to Communion as a Layman. And upon this Principle it was asserted in the Council under *Cyprian*<sup>i</sup>, that as Hereticks and Schismatics were to be Rebaptized, so all that were Ordained by them, were only to be received as Laymen. And indeed, upon this very Principle, if *St. Basil* says true<sup>k</sup>, both *Cyprian* and *Firmilian* required Hereticks and Schismatics to be Rebaptized, because their Baptism was no other than the Baptism of Laymen. So that they must needs suppose, that Hereticks and Schismatics were only Laymen, else the Foundation of their Argument had been faulty. And, tho' they drew a wrong Conclusion from that Principle, which the Church, in after Ages, by her General Councils, corrected; yet she never denied their Principle, but acted still in Conformity to it, reducing Hereticks, and Schismatics, and Degraded Clerks, to Lay-communion, except where some Intervening Necessity and Extraordinary Occasion required her to relax her Discipline, as in the Case of the *Novatians* and *Donatists*, and some few others, in order to make up the Churches Peace, and

put

<sup>i</sup> *Conc. Carthag. ap Cyprian. n. 4. p. 231.* Novatus à Thaumagade dixit, Omnes Schismaticos & Hæreticos, qui ad Ecclesiam conversi sunt, baptizari; sed & eos qui ordinati videbantur, inter Laicos recipi.

<sup>k</sup> *Basil. Can. 1.*



put an end to an Inveterate Schism. Of which I shall make full Proof in pursuing the subsequent Practice of the Unversal Church, by which it will evidently appear, that the Ordinary way of treating Hereticks and Schismaticks and Degraded Clerks, was, according to the *Cyprianick* Age, to reduce them still to Lay-Communion.

This appears first from those Canons which go under the name of, *The Apostolical Canons*, if we allow those to be of later Date than *Cyprian*. For in two of those Rules there is this Direction. In the fifteenth Canon it is ordered, That if any Clerk run from his own Diocese to another; and refuse to return again at the Command of his own Bishop, he shall be Degraded from his Ministry, and only be allowed to Communicate as a Layman, *ὡς λαϊκὸς κοινωνεῖτω*. And in the Sixty-second Canon it is said, If any Clerk, through Humane Fear of a Jew, or Greek, or Heretick, denies himself to be a Clerk, he shall be Deposed, and upon his Repentance be admitted to Communicate only as a Layman, *ὡς λαϊκὸς δεχθήτω*. By which any one may judge, that being Deposed from the Ministry, and being made a Layman, are words of the same Importance, according to the Sense of those ancient Canons. See also *Can. 9. al. 12.*

§. 4.

And from the Apostolical Canons.

We have the same Rule in the ancient Council of *Eliberis*, which orders, That if a Deacon suffered himself to be Ordained, when he was conscious to himself of having

§. 5.

And the Council of Eliberis.



having committed a Mortal Sin; if he confessed it voluntarily himself, he should be admitted to Communion after three Years Penance: But if another detected <sup>1</sup> him, he should do Penance for five Years, and then only be admitted to Lay-Communion.

§. 6. Such another Canon we have in the Great Council of Sardica, where the Case of two faulty Bishops, *Musæus* and *Eutychian*, was examined, and a Decree to this purpose made upon it, That neither of them should thenceforth assume to themselves the Name of Bishops, nor be esteemed as such: But if they <sup>m</sup> desired Lay-Communion, it should not be denied them.

§. 7. A like Decree was made in the Council of *Agde*, for the French Churches, where it is ordered, That if a Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon, committed a Capital Crime <sup>n</sup>, or falsified a Deed, or gave a false Witness, he should be Deposed from the Honour of

<sup>1</sup> *Conc. Eliber. can. 76.* Si quis Diaconus se permiserit ordinari, & postea fuerit in crimine detectus mortis, quod aliquando commiserit; si sponte fuerit confessus, placuit eum, acta legitima poenitentia, post triennium accipere communionem. Quod si alius detexerit, post Quinquennium acta poenitentia, accipere Communionem Laicam debere.

<sup>m</sup> *Conc. Sardic. Can. 20.* 'Εἰ δὲ λαϊκὴν κοινωνίαν ἀπαρτίεν, μὴ χεῖναι αὐτὲς ἀπαρνεῖσθαι.

<sup>n</sup> *Conc. Agathen. can. 50.* Si Episcopus, Presbyter, aut Diaconus capitale crimen commiserit, aut chartam falsaverit, aut testimonium falsum dixerit, ab Officii honore de positus, in Monasterium retrudatur, & ibi quamdiu vixerit, Laicam tantummodo Communionem accipiat.



of his Office, and be thrust into a Monastery, and there, as long as he lived, have only the Privilege of Lay-Communion.

The third Council of Orleans <sup>The Council of Orleans</sup> has two Canons to the same purpose. The first concerns all the Clergy, from Bishops down to Subdeacons, who are forbidden to cohabit with their Wives, under Pain of being Deposed from their Office, according to the Decrees of former Canons, and being Reduced to Lay-Communion. The other forbids all the same Orders of the Clergy to exercise Usury, under the same Penalty, threatening, that if any one presume to transgress their Decrees, he shall be Degraded from his Order, and only be admitted to Communion; that is, to Lay-Communion. For no other Communion can here be meant, since he was excluded from Clerical Communion by his Degradation.

The first Council of Toledo <sup>The first Council of Toledo</sup> has such another Canon about Subdeacons, That if any of them marry a third Wife, he shall be Excommunicated for two Years, and then being reconciled by Penance, be admitted to Commu-  
K nicate

o Conc. Aurelian. 3. Can. 2. Quod si fecerit, Laica Communionem contentus, juxta priorum Canonum Statuta ab Officio deponatur.

o Ibid. Can. 26. Quod si quis adversus hanc Statuta venire presumpserit, Communionem concessa, ab Ordine degradetur.

o Conc. Toledo. Can. 4. Qui tertiam acceperit, ab illentus biennio, postea inter Laicos reconciliatus per poenitentiam communicet.



nicate only as a Layman. And in the next Canon, a Presbyter or a Deacon neglecting the Daily Sacrifice <sup>r</sup> is no longer to be reputed a Clerk, if after he is reprimanded by the Bishop for his Fault, he refuses to ask Pardon and make Satisfaction.

<sup>S. 10.</sup> The Council of Hippo in Africa, made the same Order about the Donatists <sup>t</sup>, That they should only be received in the number of Laymen. And tho' this Rule was afterward dispensed with for the sake of Peace, and to put an end to the inveterate Schism of the Donatists; yet St. Austin <sup>t</sup> plainly tells us, That in strictness of Discipline this would not have been allowed with any other view but only that of Peace. For he thus answers the Objection of the Donatists, who pertly demanded of him, How it came to pass, that, if it was necessary in order to Salvation for a Donatist to repent of his being out of the Church and against the Church, notwithstanding this the Donatist Clergy and Bishops were suffered to continue in their Station after their Repentance? To this he replies, That this would

<sup>r</sup> *Ibid. Can. 5.* Presbyter aut Diaconus --- Clericus non habeatur, si castigatus, per satisfactionem veniam ab Episcopo noluit promereri.

<sup>t</sup> *Conc. Hippon. Can. 41.* Ut Donatistæ in numero Laicorum recipiantur.

<sup>t</sup> *Aug. Ep. 50. ad Bonifac. p. 87.* Si ergo, inquiunt, oportet ut nos extra Ecclesiam & adversus Ecclesiam fuisse poeniteat, ut salvi esse possimus, quomodo post istam poenitentiam apud vos Clerici vel etiam Episcopi permanemus? Hoc non fieret, quoniam revera, quod fatendum est, fieri non deberet,



would not have been allowed, because, in truth, it ought not to have been allowed, but only that the consideration of Peace makes some Compensation and Atonement for it. Therefore the *Donatists* ought rather to turn this Objection against themselves, and grieve the more humbly and heartily, that they lie in such a Death of Schism, as that nothing can revive them but making such a Wound in the Discipline of their Catholick Mother. For this was the ordinary Rule of the Church, that no one, after he had done Penance for any Crime, should either be promoted to the Office of a Clerk, or return to his Office, or continue in his Office; which was done, not to make Men despair of Pardon, but to keep up Discipline in its just Rigour and Strictness. Otherwise we should dispute against the Power of the Keys committed to the Church, of which it is said, *Whatsoever ye loose upon Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.* But lest Men should proudly repent of their

K 2

deberet, nisi Pacis ipsius compensatione sanaretur. Sed sibi hoc dicant, & multo maxime humiliter doleant, qui in tanta morte præcisionis jacent, ut isto quodam vulnere Matris Catholicæ reviviscant. --- Ut enim constitueretur in Ecclesia, ne quisquam post alicujus Criminis poenitentiam Clericatum accipiat, vel ad Clericatum redeat, vel in Clericatu maneat, non desperatione Indulgentiæ, sed rigore factum est Disciplina: alioquin contra Claves datas Ecclesiæ disputabitur, de quibus dictum est, Quæ solveritis in terra, soluta erunt & in Coelo. Sed ne forsitan etiam de cæteris criminibus, spe honoris Ecclesiastici animus intumescens superbe ageret poenitentiam, severissime placuit, ut post actam de crimine damnabili poenitentiam, nemo sit Clericus, ut desperatione temporalis altitudinis medicina major & verior esset humilitatis. --- Verum in hujusmodi causis, ubi per graves dissensionum scissuras non hujus aut illius hominis est periculum, sed populorum Strages jacent, detrahendum est aliquid severitati, ut majoribus malis sanandis charitas sincera subveniat.



their Crimes in hopes of an Ecclesiastical Promotion, this Severity was wisely agreed upon, That after a Man had done Penance for any damnable Crime, he should not be made a Clerk, that by despairing of Temporal Promotion, the Medicine of Humility might work a more sincere and effectual Cure in him. But in such Cases as these, when by reason of great Dissensions and Schisms, it was not one or two single Persons that were in danger, but whole Multitudes that lay prostrate and slain, then something was to be abated of the strict severity of Discipline, that Charity might come in to assist in the Cure of greater Evils.

I have transcribed this whole Passage of *St. Austin*, to shew, both what was the ordinary strictness of the Churches Discipline in this Case, and what those Reasons were that sometime obliged her to alter her Measures upon extraordinary Occasions. By which it appears, that notwithstanding such Dispensations upon great Exigencies, her ordinary and standing Method was to reduce Hereticks, and Schismatics, and other Delinquent Clerks to the State and Communion of Laymen.

*St. I.* For the Practice of the Church of *Rome*, we have the *Decrees of Pope Innocent*. Testimony of *Pope Innocent*, who was Cotemporary with *St. Austin*. For we have heard him declare before, in the last Chapter, *n. 8.* That it was the constant Custom of the *Roman Church*, to receive those that came over from Hereticks, only to Lay-Communion by Imposition of Hands, but not to allow them the least Honour of Clerical Promotion.

Pope



Pope *Siricius* mentions the same Discipline, as exercised upon all such Clerks as had, against Canon, either married a Widow, or a second Wife: They were to be deprived of all Ecclesiastical Dignity, and only admitted to Lay-Communion. And St. *Ferdin* says the same of Heretical Bishops, in his Dialogue against the *Luciferians*, cap. 7.

Among the Canons of St. *Basil*, there is one to the same purpose, "That such Clerks as committed mortal Sin should be Degraded, or Deposed from their Order, but be still allowed to Communicate as Laymen. Because except in some special Cases, a Clerk was not to be punished doubly for the same Fault, that is, both by Deposition and Excommunication."

All this is confirmed by a Canon of the Council of *Trullo*, which says, "When Delinquent Clerks are Degraded by a Com-  
plete and Perpetual Deposition, they are then thrust

*Siric. Ep. 1. ad Himerium Tarracōn. l. c. 11. Quisquis sane Clericus aut Viduam, aut certe secundam conjugem duxerit, omni Ecclesiasticæ dignitatis privilegio mox nudetur, Laica sibi tantum Communionē concessa.*

*Basil. Can. 22. Οἱ τὴν πρὸς θάνατον ἁμαρτίαν ἁμαρτάνοντες κληρικοὶ, τὸ βαθμῆ μὲν κατὰ γένει, τῆς κοινωνίας δὲ τῆς λαϊκῶν ἐκ ἐξείργονται. Οὐ γὰρ ἐκδικήσεις εἰς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.*



“thrust down to the place <sup>x</sup> of Laymen.” So that we have as good Proof of the Discipline of the Church, upon this Head, as need be required.

Now then, upon the whole Matter, let any Impartial Man judge of the Sense and Practice of the ancient Church, in reference to the Admission of such Baptisms, as were given in due Form by Unauthorized Laymen. If the Church had no other Opinion of Hereticks, and Schismatics, and Degraded Clerks, but as of Unauthorized Laymen; and yet admitted the Baptisms of all such so far, as not to repeat them again by Rebaptization: Does it not plainly follow, that she admitted the Baptisms of those who, in her Opinion, were only Unauthorized Laymen? If any one says, they were reduced to Lay-Communion, but yet were Authorized Priests, and not Laymen, he must first answer Cyprian, and all the other Bishops of the World, who say, in the plainest Terms, that they are not Priests, but Laymen; not like Laymen, but really so. And then he must shew likewise, how a Man can be said to have the Authority of a Priest, when GOD and CHRIST and the best Authority in the Church, have taken away his Authority from him. And when this is done, there will remain another Difficulty behind, How a Man can be said to be an Authorized Priest, who is not a Compleat and Perfect Layman: As no Heretick, or Schismatick, or Degraded Clerk, after they are Anathematized for their Obstinacy, can be said

<sup>x</sup> Conc. Trull. Can. 21. Ἐν τῷ τῆς λαϊκῶν ἀποθέσει  
τοῦ τόπου.



to be : For they are then not only reduced to the Communion of Laymen, but sunk one Degree below Laymen, by being Excommunicate or cast out of the Church : For no Man is a Compleat Layman, but he that is in Full Communion with the Church ; which Hereticks, and Schismaticks, and Degraded Clerks are not, after Excommunication is once added to their Deprivation, as it sometimes was when they persisted Obstinate and Contumacious against the Discipline of the Church : Of which I shall give a more distinct and full Account in the following Chapter.

A

CHAP. K 4



to be: For they are then not only reduced to the Communion of Laymen, but sunk one Degree below it. **C. H. A. P. V.** **Argum. 4.** *That Hereticks, and Schismatics, and Degraded Clerks, were not accounted Authorized Priests, because they were sometimes thrust down one Degree below Laymen, by being Anathematized and cast out of the Communion of the Church.*

§. 1.

*That no Man is reckoned a compleat Layman but he that is in full Communion with the Church.*

**A**LL that has been said in the last Chapter, of Hereticks, and Schismatics, and Degraded Clerks being reduced to the Communion of Laymen, goes upon Supposition of their being Penitent, and that they quietly submitted to the Churches Discipline, when they were corrected for their Faults: For, in that Case, the Church, in her Punishments, shewed them some Favour, when they did not add Obstinacy and Rebellion to their other Crimes; she thought it enough to punish Ordinary Crimes in Penitent Clerks by the single Punishment of Degradation from their Orders, and Reduction of them to Lay-Communion, and did not proceed to the utmost Severity of Excommunication with them, unless for some higher Crimes of a more Malignant Nature, or unless they proved Refractory and Contumacious against her Censures. There are some ancient Canons which give particular Direction about this matter, that a Delinquent Clerk should not be punished twice for the same Fault,



Fault, in Ordinary Cases, that is, he should not both be Degraded, and cast out of Lay-Communion also. But then, this was upon Supposition, that he submitted quietly to the Churches Censure, and that his Crimes, also, were not of such a nature as to require a more severe Judgment and Condemnation. For otherwise both these Punishments might be inflicted on him; he might not only be deprived of Clerical Communion, but of Lay-Communion also, and, at the same time that he was cast out of his Orders, be cast out of the Church, and be cut off entirely from all Communion whatsoever. And this was sinking him one Degree below a Layman: For no Man was accounted a Compleat Layman, but he that was in full Communion with the Church, and had a Right to participate with the Faithful in all Holy Offices, and particularly the Holy Eucharist, or Oblation, which was the *τὸ τέλειον*, the Consummation of all, and that which made a Man a Perfect and Compleat Christian. For without this a Man was only an Imperfect Christian, and in an Incomplete State, and scarce to be reckoned of as a Perfect and Proper Member of the Church. Upon this account all Catechumens were reckoned but Imperfect Members of the Church (tho' they had, in a large Sense, the Name of Christians) because, while they remained Unbaptized, they had no Right to the full Communion of the Faithful. In like manner all Excommunicate Persons were at most but Incomplete Christians, by being cut off from the Communion of the Church; they were but a sort of Dead Members



bers, till they revived again by Repentance, and were restored by vertue of the Right which Baptism gives them to be admitted to Communion again upon Confession and Satisfaction. And in this State, all such Hereticks, and Schismatics, and Degraded Clerks were supposed to be, who underwent a double Punishment, and had Excommunication added to their Deposition. They were, by this means, shut out of the Church, and denied the Privilege even of Lay-Communion. So that they were not so much as Compleat and Perfect Laymen, but one Degree lower than Laymen, having lost their present Right to Full Communion, and retaining little more besides their Baptism to entitle them to the Name of Christians. It is not easy to conceive then, how they should be esteemed true Authorized Priests by the Church, whom she herself excluded from the Privilege of true Compleat Christian Laymen.

*§. 2. Hereticks, and Schismatics, and Degraded Clerks, sometimes denied also the Privilege of Lay-Communion.* But now, that the Church did many times exercise this double Censure, and inflict both the Punishment of Deposition and Excommunication upon them, will be no hard matter to be made appear. For, not to mention now how often Hereticks are laid under Anathema by the six General Councils, of which I have given a full Account in the first Chapter of this Book, nor how unanimously all the Ancients declare all Hereticks and Schismatics to be out of the True and Perfect Communion of the Holy Catholick Church; nor how often Hereticks are said to be no Christians, no Church, nor Members of the Church, meaning



meaning thereby Christians in the Adequate Sense, and Persons in full Communion with the Church: I say, not to insist upon any thing of this, at present, it will be sufficient to shew, That Hereticks, and Schismatics, and Degraded Clerks, were sometimes, after their Deposition, also formally Excommunicated by the Church, and denied even the Communion of Laymen.

This is evident from what *Cyprian* says of *Evarestus*, one of the Three Bishops that pretended to Ordain *Novatian*, <sup>This proved from the Testimony of Cyprian.</sup> “That for his Crime he was “so far Degraded, as of a Bishop not to be suffered to continue in the State and Quality<sup>b</sup> of “a Layman: He was not only deprived of his “People and his See, but wholly banished the “Church, because he continued obstinate in his “Schism, and did not, as *Trophimus* had done, “submit himself by Confession and Penance, “that he might be received to Communion as “a Layman.” This was the difference the Church then made between these two Criminal Bishops, who were concerned in the Ordination of *Novatian*: They were both Deposed from their Order, and reckoned no Bishops; but the one was received into Church-Communion, upon his Repentance, as a Layman; whilst the other was wholly cast out of the Church for his Impenitency, and not allowed to enjoy either the

<sup>b</sup> In *Cypr. Ep. 49. al. 52. ad Cornel. p. 96.* Didichinus Evarestum de Episcopo jam nec Laicum remansisse, Cathedra & Plebis extorrem, & de Ecclesia Christi exsulem.



the honourable Title or Communion of a Layman. He was now less than a Layman, who a little before was a Bishop, in the Catholick Church.

Among the Apostolical Canons, And the Apostolical Canons, there are some which forbid a Clerk to be punished

doubly for the same Crime in all Ordinary Cases, as has been observed before; yet there are two Cases specified, in which Excommunication is to be added to Deposition. The first is the Case of Simony, which was a Crime of that high nature, that if any Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon was found guilty of it, both he that was Ordained, and he that Ordained him, were not only to be Degraded, but to be cut off entirely from all Church-Communion whatsoever, as Simon Magus was by Peter. The other Case was much of the same Nature, If any Bishop made use of the Secular Power (by which Learned Men understand, the Heathen Magistrate) to obtain a Church, and thereby gets Possession of it, he shall be both Deposed and Excommunicated also. There was no Favour for such Men, they must be ejected not only from Clerical Communion and Dignity, but from the common Privilege and Communion of Laymen.

This

c Canon. Apost. c. 29. Καταλείβω καὶ αὐτὸς, καὶ ὁ χειροτονήσας, καὶ ἐκκοπήσω παντὶ πᾶσι καὶ τῆς κοινωνίας.

d Ibid. can. 30. Εἰ τις ἐπίσκοπος κοσμικοῖς ἀρχεῖσι χειροτονήσας, αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν χειροτονήσαντα ἐκκλησίας γένηται, καὶ καταλείβω καὶ ἐκκοπήσω.



This was the Censure that was passed upon *Euphratas* the *Arian* Bishop of *Colen*, who, because he would not recant his Heresy, was Deposed in the Council of *Colen*, An. 349. There every Bishop gives his particular Vote against him, and one of them thus expresses his Condemnation<sup>e</sup>: “I agree to the Determination of the Synod, that *Euphratas* neither can be a Bishop, nor ought to receive the Communion of Laymen.”

The Council of *Sardica* has two very remarkable Canons upon this Subject, pronounced by the Mouth of the Famous *Hosius* Bishop of *Corduba*, who Presided in this Synod. The first is made against such Bishops as, thro’ Covetousness or Ambition, without any Legal or Synodical Call, removed themselves from one See to another, from a less City to a greater: To correct which Exorbitancy with a just Severity, it is there decreed<sup>f</sup> that such Bishops ought not to have so much as the Communion of Laymen. And again, in a second Canon, If any such Bishop plead that he was called by the Vote of the People, that being found to be only a Pretence, such an one<sup>g</sup> should not be admitted to Lay-Communion,

not

<sup>e</sup> Conc. Agrippin. in Sententia Valentini. ap. Grab. Pom. I. P. 317. Consentio Euphratam Episcopum esse non posse, qui nec Laicam debet Communionem accipere.

<sup>f</sup> Conc. Sardic. can. 1. Μηδὲ λαϊκῶν ἔχειν τὰς τοιαύτας χρῆναι κοινωνίας.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid. can. 2. Τοιοῦτον μηδὲ ἐν τῇ τέλει λαϊκῶν χρῆναι κοινωνίας.



not even at the Hour of Death. These Fathers surely could not take those for Authorized Bishops, whom they laid under such a terrible Anathema, that they did not think them worthy of the Churches Peace, *in Extremis*, but denied them the common Viaticum of Laymen, at their last Hour.

*The Council of E-* The Council of *Eliberis* has  
*liberis.* such another Canon concern-  
ing Deacons, that suffered  
themselves to be Ordained,  
when they knew themselves guilty of some  
Mortal Sin, that if it had been detected before-  
hand, would have hindered their Ordination:  
If such an one confesses his Fault voluntarily,  
then after three <sup>h</sup> Years Penance he might be  
admitted to Communion; but if he was de-  
tected by another, then he should do five Years  
Penance, and after that only be received to Lay-  
Communion at the last. And in another Canon  
they decree, That if either Bishop, Presbyter,  
or Deacon was found guilty of Fornication com-  
mitted after his Ordination, such an one <sup>i</sup> for  
the Scandal and Heinousness of his Crime,  
should not be admitted to Communion, no,  
not at his last Hour. There are a great many  
other

<sup>h</sup> *Conc. Eliber. can. 76.* Si quis Diaconum se permiserit or-  
dinari, & postea fuerit in crimine detectus mortis, quod ali-  
quando commiserit; si sponte fuerit confessus, placuit eum,  
acta legitima poenitentia post triennium accipere Communio-  
nem. Quod si alius detexerit, post quinquennium acta poeni-  
tentia, accipere Communionem Laicam debere.

<sup>i</sup> *Ibid. can. 18.* Episcopi, Presbyteri, Diaconi, si in mi-  
nisterio positi, detecti fuerint quod sint mæchati, placuit, ut  
propter Scandalum & propter nefandum crimen, nec in fine  
Communionem accipere debere.



other Canons in this Council, which deny Communion to the very last, to all such Criminals in general, as are there specified in them: And tho' the Clergy be not particularly named, yet doubtless they were included in the number, when such Crimes as Lapsing into Idolatry are ordered to be punished with perpetual Excommunication, without Readmission at their last Hour. For we cannot suppose these Canons were more favourable to the Clergy than to others, since we have found this Council inflicting the same Penalty upon them upon other Occasions.

I will conclude these Collections with the Testimony of §. 8.  
The Council of Rome, under Felix III. An. 487. a Roman Council held under Felix III. An. 487. Here the Case of several Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons came to be considered, who had submitted themselves to be Rebaptized by the Arians in Africk, during the time of the Vandalick Persecution: And the Determination that was made upon it was this: That for so doing<sup>1</sup> they should be subjected to a perpetual Penance all their Lives, and not be allowed to be present either at the Prayers of the Faithful, or the Prayers of the Catechumens, but only be restored to Lay-Communion at the Hour of Death.

Now

<sup>k</sup> Conc. Eliber. can. 2. Flamines, qui post fidem Lavacri & regenerationis sacrificaverint --- placuit eos nec in fine accipere Communionem. Vid. Can. 1. 3. &c.

<sup>1</sup> Conc. Rom. 3. sub Felice 2. al. 3. Can. 2. Conc. Tom: 4. p. 1076. Usque ad exitus sui diem, in poenitentia (si resipiscunt) jacere conveniet: Nec Orationi non modo Fidelium, sed ne Catechumenorum omnimodis interesse, quibus Communio Laica tantum in morte reddenda est.



Now then if such Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons were denied the Communion of Laymen, and only allowed it at the Point of Death, and sometimes not. That neither, it is plain, they could not be true Authorized Priests, because they were sunk one Degree below Laymen in the Church: Unless any one will say, that a Man may be an Authorized Priest of the Church, who is not so much as an Authorized Layman of it. Yet the Church never made any Order for Rebaptizing such as were Baptized by these Men, but received them as she did others, only by Imposition of Hands and Confirmation. Which is a certain Argument to prove, that she did not repeat the Baptism of Laymen, since she received not only the Baptism of those whom she herself made Laymen, but of those also whom she thrust one Degree below Laymen, by subjecting them to Excommunications and Anathema's, and denying them the Benefit and Privilege of Lay Communion in the Church.

And the Determination that was made upon it was this: That for to doing they should be subjected to a perpetual Penance all their Lives, and not be allowed to be present either at the Prayers of the Faithful, or the Prayers of the Sacraments, but only be referred to Lay-Communion at the Hour of Death.

Now

CHAP.



CHAP. VI.

*The Objection taken from the Notion of an Indelible Character imprinted in the Ordination of a Priest, examined, and shewed to be of no Force against the former Allegations. With an Account of the first Original and Meaning of that Term in the Writings of the Church.*

§. i.  
**T**HERE is but one Objection against all that has been said in the foregoing Discourse, which has occasionally been answered already: But because, to some, it seems to carry more weight than really it does, because of the Ambiguity of the Terms, I will here give it a distinct Consideration. The Objection is this: That there is an Indelible Character imprinted on a Man when he is Ordained a Priest, which no Heresy, or Schism, or Degradation, or Excommunication can Obliterate: Therefore, tho' they may suspend him from the Exercise, yet they cannot take away from him the Power and Authority of the Priesthood. The Antecedent of this Argument is, in some measure, true, if rightly explained and understood: But the Inference or Consequence drawn from it is altogether false: And unless it be false, the Catholick Church has been always under a  
 great



great Mistake, to pretend to take away the Power and Authority of Priests from them; nay, the Power of GOD and CHRIST himself could not do it, if this Notion holds true; For the Church always pretended to act by the Authority of GOD and CHRIST, that is, by the Power of the Keys committed to her, in taking away the Ministerial Authority from such Priests as deserved her Censures. So that if the Church could not do it, GOD and CHRIST could not do it, or else the Church was to blame, to assume a Power which did not belong to her. But the truth of the Matter is, that the Indelible Character of a Priest's Ordination, implied no such thing in the Opinion of the Ancients, as this Objection supposes. For they never imagined, that a Priest, by vertue of any such Character, could preserve his Ministerial Authority, in spite of all the Censures of the Church inflicted on him; that he was a Priest when they made and called him no Priest, and reduced him to the Order and Quality of a Layman; that he was a Priest when they Excommunicated and Anathematized him, and cast him not only out of Clerical Communion, but all Church-Communion, and sometimes would not allow him so much as the Communion of a Layman, at the Point of Death. There must be a strange Vertue in Indelible Character indeed, if it could preserve Sacerdotal Authority in a Priest, after so many Attempts of the Church to deprive him of it. It is therefore worth enquiring, Whether there be not some mistake in this Matter, and whether the wrong Notion some have entertained of the Nature of an Indelible Character, do not lead them into Errors about it. Now the best way to come by the true



true Notion and Import of this Term, is to examine, first, What it was taken to signify in Baptism? For an Indelible Character was always supposed to be imprinted as much in Baptism as in Ordination; tho' I do not remember that any ancient Council exprelly used that Term about either, but only say something that may be reckoned equivalent to it: And that is this, as it relates to Baptism: That a Man who is once truly baptized, can never do any thing that will so far erase or cancel his Baptism, as that he shall need, upon any Occasion, to be Rebaptized with a second Baptism. Thus far the Ancients believed an Indelible Character in Baptism. Tho' a Man turn his back on Christianity, and totally Apostatize and fall away from the Profession of it; tho' he turn Heretick or Schismatick; tho' he Excommunicate himself, or be Excommunicated by the Church; tho' he embrace Paganism or Judaism, or any other opposite Religion; tho' he Curse and Blaspheme CHRIST in a Synagogue or in a Temple, as many of the old Apostates did; tho' he become a *Julian* or an *Ecebolius*, and *trample under Foot the Son of GOD*, and *count the Blood of the Covenant an unholy thing*, and *do despite to the Spirit of Grace*; yet, after all, if this Man turn again to Christianity, he was not to be received by a second Baptism: His Repentance and the Churches Absolution was sufficient in that Case to reinstate him in his ancient Profession, and he was not to be Rebaptized to be made again a Christian. The Church had but one Baptism for the Remission of Sins, and the Vertue of that was so far Indelible, that it would always qualify the Man that had received it, to be admitted to Communion again after the greatest

L 2

Apostacy,



Apostacy, only by a true Repentance and Reconciliatory Imposition of Hands, without Rebaptizing. This was what the Ancients understood by what we now call the Indelible Character of Baptism. But they were far from thinking, that a Man who was such an Apostate had any Right or Authority, whilst he was an Apostate, to challenge any of the common Privileges of a Christian: They did not think whilst he was a Pagan or a Jew, that he was properly a Member of the Christian Church still, because of his Baptism; or that he had any Right to be called Christian, or to be admitted to the Prayers of the Church, and much less to the Communion with other faithful Laymen: And yet, after all, there was so much of a Christian in him, by vertue of his Baptism, that he needed not to be Baptized again as a mere *Jew* or *Pagan*. His Baptism was such as nothing could obliterate; it would remain with him when he was an Apostate, and either go to Hell with him to his Condemnation, or bring him back to Heaven and the Church by the way of Repentance, not Rebaptization. Now if any one should ask, Whether such an Apostate, while he continued an Apostate, was a Christian? The Answer must be in the Negative, or, at least, with the Qualification of a common School Distinction of, *Simpliciter* & *secundum Quid*. For, Simply and Absolutely speaking, it would be incongruous and against Propriety of Speech, to call an Apostate, *Jew*, or *Heathen*, or *Turk*, a Christian: For Words and Names, when they have no Limitation to any more particular meaning, are to be taken, *in sensu famosiori*, according to the common Sense in which they are usually understood.

Now



Now by a Christian, properly speaking, we usually mean a Man in Perfect and Full Communion with the Christian Church. Therefore an Apostate from Christianity is never Absolutely and Simply called a Christian, but an Apostate, whether it be *Jew*, or *Pagan*, or *Mahometan*, or under any other Denomination. But yet there is something of a Christian in this Apostate, that is, his Baptism; in respect of which he is not so perfectly a No-Christian, as one that never was Baptized: And if in this Respect only, in such a Qualified Sense, any one will give him the Title of an Apostate Christian, which is, as the Schools speak, only a Christian *Secundum Quid*, in respect of the Baptism which he once received in the Christian Church, and which will for ever continue with him; I cannot think it worth while to contend about Words or Names, when Men are otherwise agreed about the Import and Signification of them. Let him be a Christian in this Sense, yet he has no Right or Authority, till he Repents and is Reconciled, to join in Communion with true Christian Laymen, notwithstanding the Indelible Character of his Baptism. And they who would fain make something more of this Character, either understand not what it means, or what has been the true Discipline of the Christian Church in reference to the Reiteration of Baptism.

Having seen the whole Mystery that is contained under this hard word, *Indelible Character*, in Baptism: Let us now examine, Whether it be not much after the same manner in the Inde-

§. 2.  
*That the Indelible Character of Ordination is of the same nature.*



lible Character of Ordination. A Priest when he is Ordained, receives such a Consecration to a Ministerial Office by Imposition of Hands, as needs not upon any Occasion to be a second time repeated, to establish him in the execution of such an Office. There is the Indelible Character of it, the very same as is in Baptism; a Man needs no more to be Reordained, than to be Rebaptized. But what if a Priest should turn Idolater or Apostate, and offer Sacrifice at the Heathen Altars, instead of the Altar of God? Would he preserve the Authority of a true Christian Priest, or the Name and Office of a Priest, whilst he was actually engaged in such Diabolical Prevarication? Would the Vertue of Indelible Character have been thought to extend so far as this, by the ancient Councils of the Church? They who say so, and would perswade the World to believe so, must first reconcile Contradictions, and shew how a Man can have the Authority of a Priest, when his own Apostacy, and God and the Church, by their Censures, have taken his Authority from him. Let them produce as good Proofs for that, from ancient Councils, as I have produced to the contrary, and then, perhaps, the Notion of an Indelible Character may seem to have more Weight in it than I have represented. But, till that be done, I believe the World will hardly be perswaded, that an Apostate Priest retains the Right and Authority of a true Christian Priest, any more than an Apostate Layman retains the Right and Authority of a true Christian Layman. A Priest indeed may be admitted, if the Church thinks fit, to Clerical Communion again, without a new Ordination, as a Layman may be

admitted



admitted to Lay-Communion, without a new Baptism: But that is all that an Indelible Character can signify in either. It does not give Authority to an Apostate Priest, to act as a Priest of God, whilst he continues an Apostate, and is deprived by God and the Church of all Authority of the Priesthood. If the Church, in some great Exigency, receives such an one to his Office again (which she never did but upon some very extraordinary Occasion) in that Case there was no need of a new Ordination, but only to relax her Censures, and give him that Authority again, which his Crimes and her Censures had taken from him. And this was parallel to the Case of Baptism. There was no need to Baptize a Man a second time, in order to admit an Apostate to the Communion of Laymen: In like manner, there was no need to Ordain a Man a second time, in order to admit him to Clerical Communion. The way of Admission was the same in both; it was done by Repentance and Absolution, without Rebaptizing the one, or Reordaining the other. So that the Notion of an Indelible Character could signify no more in the one Case, than it did in the other. Therefore, as an Apostate Layman had not the Right and Authority of a Lay-Christian, whilst he continued an Impenitent Apostate, notwithstanding any Force of the Indelible Character of his Baptism; but might be admitted to the Privilege of Lay-Communion again without Rebaptizing, when the Church thought fit to loose him from his Bonds, and reconcile him by the Power of the Keys committed to her: So, in like manner, an Apostate Priest had not the Right and Authority of a Christian



Priest, whilst he continued an Apostate, notwithstanding any Force of the Indelible Character of his Ordination; but only was in a Capacity to Officiate again without Reordaining, if the Church should find it necessary to employ such an one again, by restoring him to the Authority which by her Censures she had taken from him. And unless this be allowed, we make plain Nonsense of all the ancient Councils, and charge them moreover with Tyranny and Usurpation, in pretending God's Authority to take away the Name, and Office, and Authority of the Priesthood from Delinquent Clerks, when no such Power or Authority was committed to them. And there is an end too of all the Discipline of the Church, as to what concerns the Censure of her Delinquent Clergy: She may curb and correct her Laity, and deprive them of all Right and Title to the Communion of Christian Laymen; but all her Censures are but a *Brutum Fulmen* against the Clergy. For if after she has degraded a Priest, and said, He neither is, nor shall be a Priest; shall neither have the Name, nor Office, nor Dignity, nor the Authority of a Priest, but only Act and Communicate as a Private Layman: If after she has also Excommunicated a Contumacious Priest, and by casting him out of the Church, reduced him to a State one Degree below a Layman; notwithstanding all this, that Priest can pretend, that by vertue of his Indelible Character, he is as true an Authorized Priest, after all the Thundrings of the Church against him, as he was before: What then becomes of all the Power and Discipline of the Church, and all her Authority to Censure and Silence Offend-

ing



ing and Apostate Priests? A Censure, it seems, may affect the Conscience of a Priest, but not his Authority: That will remain entire to him by virtue of his Indelible Character, let the Church use what Authority she will to Deprive or Degrade him. I wish the Defenders of this Unlimited Power, would not undermine the Authority of the Church, whilst they are so seemingly zealous to defend the Authority of the Priesthood. I desire them to read over all the Canons of the Ancient Councils, as I have done upon this Occasion, and then see whether they can find any one single Canon, that places any such Vertue in an Indelible Character as is here pretended.

Indeed the Name of *Indelible Character*, never so much as occurs once expressly in any Act or Canon of an Ancient Council. And they who have been most Inquisitive after its Synodical Establishment, are at a loss to find it any where else but in the Council of *Florence* or the Council of *Trent*: Which is an Argument that the Ancient Councils knew nothing of it. But if they did not own the Name, they might, however, own the Thing in other Terms. Yes, in a Qualified Sense, as I have explained it. They owned, that a Man who was once truly Baptized, whether in the Church or out of the Church, whether by a true Authorized Catholic Priest, or by an Heretical Apostate, could never want a second Baptism to reconcile him to the Church after any Transgression. And they likewise owned, that a Man who was once truly Ordained a Priest, could never want a second

§. 3.

*The Name of Indelible Character not to be found in any ancient Council.*



second Ordination to qualify him to officiate as a Minister in the Church, if the Church thought fit to receive him into Office again, and give him her Authority and Commission to Act, after any great Apostacy or Censure. But they never said, that when they had bound an Apostate under all the Bonds of Anathema and Excommunication, and divested him of all Clerical Power and Authority, that still he had the Authority of a Priest, when they had taken it from him. Such a Notion of Indelible Character, I will venture to affirm, is not to be met with in any ancient Council.

S. 4.

*In what Sense St. Austin owns and allows it in Heretical Priests.*

The Fathers indeed very often call Baptism by the Name of *σφραγίς* and *σημεῖον*, which we may translate indifferently a Seal, or a Sign, or a Mark, or a Character. And in St. Austin the Term *Character Dominicus*, and *Character Regius*, *The Lord's Character*, and *The Royal Character*, is frequently used when he speaks of Baptism. But then by this they mean, Baptism itself only, and not any distinct Character, or Quality, or Spiritual Sign imprest upon the Soul, and that distinct from Sanctifying Grace too, as the modern Schoolmen love to word it: For it was only another Name for Baptism, which was the Mark or Character by which Compleat Christians, who devoted themselves to CHRIST, were distinguished from Jews and Pagans, who had no such Character upon them. And therefore so far as Baptism was Indelible, so far this Character was Indelible, but no further. St. Austin used the same Term about Ordination, and he makes the Indelibility both of Baptism and Or-



dination, as I conceive, to consist in this, That a Man once truly Baptized or Ordained, tho' he turn Apostate, never needs a second Baptism or a second Ordination. "It is manifest, says he, that Baptism<sup>a</sup> remains inseparably in the Baptized Person, because whatever depth of Iniquity, whatever horrible gulph of Sin he falls into, tho' it be into the Ruine of Apostacy, he never wants Baptism; and therefore whenever he returns by Repentance, his Baptism is not repeated, because he is judged not to want it." This he often repeats in his Books against the Donatists<sup>b</sup>; and observes farther, that<sup>c</sup> Cyprian himself, and all that followed him, were of the same Opinion: Which appears from<sup>d</sup> several of Cyprian's Epistles, and the Council of Carthage held under him: For tho' they Rebaptized such as were Baptized by Hereticks and Schismaticks, yet they never Rebaptized any that had been Baptized in the Church, tho' they Lapsed, or Apostatized, or fell from the Church into any Heresy or Schism; because they supposed, with St. Austin, that no Crime could so far obliterate or extinguish Baptism, as to make an Apostate need a second Baptism. And as an Apostate Layman could not

<sup>a</sup> Aug. de Bapt. Lib. 5. c. 15. In baptizato baptisma Inseparabiliter permanere manifestum est, quia in quodlibet profundum malorum, & in quamlibet horribilem Voraginem peccatorum irruat baptizatus usque ad Apostaticam ruinam, non caret baptismo; & ideo per poenitentiam redeunti non redditur, quia eo non potuisse carere judicatur.

<sup>b</sup> Aug. de Bapt. Lib. 1. c. 1. It. Lib. 6. c. 15. Cont. Crescon. Lib. 2. c. 16. Cont. Liter. Petil. Lib. 2. c. 7. & 48.

<sup>c</sup> Aug. de Bapt. Lib. 3. c. 11.

<sup>d</sup> Cypr. Ep. 71. ad Quintum, p. 194. Ep. 74. ad Pompeium, p. 216. Conc. Carthag. ap. Cypr. n. 8. & 22.



not need a second Baptism to make him a compleat Lay-Christian, but only Repentance and Absolution, to reinstate him in full Communion with the Church; so an Apostate Clergyman, tho' he was reduced to Lay-Communion, or fall'n below it, could not need a new Ordination, but only the Churches Commission and Authority to release him of his Bonds, and invest him with Clerical Power again; which she did by Absolution, or the Power of the Keys, and not a new Ordination. Thus far therefore St. *Augustine* and all the Ancients allow both Baptism and Ordination to be given Inseparably to those to whom they are given: They are Indelible so far as that neither of them need to be repeated upon Apostates; But that Apostates, whilst they remain Apostates, are still true Authorized Priests, is a Doctrine not to be met with in any ancient Council of the Church, nor Private Writer.

S. 5. But it may be said, that  
*What the Papists mean by their Indelible Character.* Modern Writers take Indelible Character in another Sense, and extend it so far as to preserve the Authority of a Priest in him, even after the Church has Degraded or Excommunicated him by her Lawful Censures. But who are these Modern Writers? Either those of the Popish or Protestant Communion. For the Popish Writers, I own, they make quite another thing of the Indelible Character, from what the



the Ancients did, tho' they can scarce tell an Intelligent Reader what they mean by it. Some call it a Spiritual Relation, others a Spiritual Quality imprinted on the Soul, as an Effect of Baptism, distinct both from the External Sacrament, and the Internal Sanctifying Grace of it. Which is a sort of abstruse Language the Ancients were not acquainted with. But whatever the Nature of it be, they are thus far agreed with the Ancients, that the Indelibility of it consists in this, That a Baptism once truly given, needs not upon any occasion to be Repeated. As to the Character of a Priest given him in his Ordination, they seem still to recede farther from the Doctrine of the Ancients. For it does not suffice them to say, It is such an Indelible Character as may qualify a Degraded Priest to Officiate again without a new Ordination, if the Church think fit to recal him to his Station; but they will have it to be a perpetual Spiritual Power or Authority impressed upon the Soul of a Priest, which no Removal from his Office can take from him: For so *Bellarmin* f the great Oracle of the *Romish* Church, in exprefs Terms, delivers it as the *Catholick* Opinion. Which is as contrary to the common Sentiments of the ancient Church, as the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent* is contrary to the Doctrine and Discipline of the first Six General Councils; which take away all Power and Authority from Degraded Clerks, till the Church thinks fit to restore them to their Authority

f *Bellarmin. de Sacramento Ordinis. Lib. 1. cap. 10. Tom. 2. p. 970.* Convenit inter Catholicos, duplicem esse effectum hujus Sacramenti, primo Potestatem Spiritualem Perpetuam, in cujus signum imprimitur Character, &c.



thority again, by a Relaxation of her Censures. There is a plain Opposition and Contrariety in the Stile and Language of the Ancient Church to this Modern New Doctrine. "We deprive a Wicked Priest of the Power and Authority of his Priesthood," say the ancient Councils. "No," says *Bellarmin*, that ye cannot do; ye may remove him from his Office, but ye cannot take away his Spiritual Power; that remains imprinted on his Soul by an Indelible Character." "We make him no Priest," say the ancient Councils, we leave him not so much as the Name of a Priest, we reduce him from the Order of Priests to the Order of Laymen." "Hold there," says *Bellarmin*, "none but Modern Hereticks do this: It is not in the Power of the Church to make a Man who is one Day a Priest, the next Day to become a Layman." Is not this to make Hereticks of all the ancient Church, and to talk in a Stile that they were utter Strangers to? Unless any one will soften *Bellarmin's* Words, and say, He means no more by his Perpetual Spiritual Power and Character of a Priest, than that the Church may recal him to his Office again, if she pleases, without giving him a new Ordination.

## §. 6.

*How far an Indelible Character is allowed by Protestant Writers.*

But, in the gross Sense of the Words, it is not more contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of the Ancient Church, than it is to the General Stream and Current of Protestant Writers. *Bellarmin* himself owns this: For he says, All the Hereticks of these times (by whom he means all the Protestants, from the Days of *Wicklef*



*Wicklef* to his own time) deny this Character, <sup>g</sup> as he describes it. For they will have the Ecclesiastical Ministry to be only a Simple Office, which may be given and taken away again; so that a Man may be to morrow a Layman, who to day is a Minister and a Pastor. This was then the general Sense of the Protestants about this new *Roman* Character, if *Bellarmin* do not misrepresent them. And that he did not much wrong them, appears from the Opposition which they presently made to the Council of *Trent*, as soon as she had framed her Canon about this Indelible Character, with an Anathema (as if it had been the greatest Point of Faith) against those that did not believe it. *Calvin* wrote his *Antidote*, and *Kemnitius* his *Examen of the Council of Trent*, and they both reject and refute it as a Modern Fiction. *Calvin* says, "It was a Fable first invented in the Schools of the Ignorant Monks <sup>h</sup>, and that the Ancients were altogether Strangers to it; And that it had more of the Nature of a Magical Incantment, than of the Sound Doctrine of the Gospel in it. And therefore it might be rejected with the same Facility that it was invented." *Chamier* confirms his Notion of the Novelty of it at large, not only from the Fathers,

<sup>g</sup> *Bellarmin. ibid.* Hæretici hujus temporis Characterem præcipue negant. Volunt enim Ministerium Ecclesiasticum esse Simplex Officium, quod possit dari & auferri; proinde cras fieri Laicos, qui sunt hodie Ministri vel Pastores.

<sup>h</sup> *Calvin. Antidot. Conc. Trident. Sess. 7. Can. 9.* Quod de Characterē Indelebili fabulantur, ex eadem prodiit Officina: Nam Veteribus hoc totum ignotum fuit: Et magis consentaneum est Incantationibus Magicis quam sanæ Evangelii Doctrinæ. Eadem ergo facilitate repudiabitur, qua excogitatum fuit.



thers, but from the Schoolmen themselves i, from *Durandus*, and *Scotus*, and *Gabriel Biel*, and *De Rubicne*, and *Cajetan*, who all confess, that there are no Footsteps of it to be found, either in Scripture or Antiquity, but that it is wholly owing to the Authority of the Church, and that not very ancient neither. For it is observable, that *Peter Lombard* knew nothing of it: He never mentions any other Character but the Character <sup>k</sup> of CHRIST in Baptism, by which he means only the External Form of Baptizing, *In the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, which Form or Character is owned to be ancient enough, but is far from being that Internal Quality which is pretended to be imprinted on the Soul. He that would see more of the Protestant Allegations and Oppositions against this Novelty, may consult *Kemnitius* <sup>l</sup>, and *Rivet* <sup>m</sup>, and *Vorstius* <sup>n</sup>, and *Gerhard* <sup>o</sup>, and *Alting* <sup>p</sup>, and *Perkins* and *Amesius* <sup>q</sup>, and such others as have written particular Dissertations against it. I shall only trouble the Reader with one of them, the famous *Turretin*, who was a Man of great Judgment and Learning in this last

i Chamier. Panstrat. Tom. 4. de Sacramentis Lib. 2. cap. 12. n. 4.

k Lombard. Lib. 4. Distinct. 6. p. 303. Ex his aperte colligitur, quod qui etiam ab Hæreticis baptizati sunt, servato Characterē Christi, rebaptizandi non sunt, &c.

l Kemnit. Exam. Concil. Trid. Part. 2. ad Canon. 9. Sess. 7. p. 25.

m Rivet. Cathol. Orthodox. Tract. 3. Quæst. 6.

n Vorstius. Antibellarmin. p. 361.

o Gerhard. Loci Commun. Tom. 4. de Sacramentis. n. 95. p. 184.

p Alting. Theolog. Elenctica Loc. 14. p. 594.

q Perkins. Demonstratio Problematis p. 130.

Ames. Bellarmin. Enervat. Tom. 3. cap. 5. p. 47.



last Age. His Account of the Matter, as it is summed up by his Contractor *Riissenius*<sup>r</sup>, is this: That the three Sacraments, of Baptism, Confirmation and Orders, according to the Popish Doctrine, imprint a Spiritual and Indelible Character in the Soul; which is given as the Reason why they cannot be Reiterated or Repeated. But we reject this Device as a Fiction, and we say, The Faithful indeed, have a double Seal or Character, the one Internal, which is the Ob signation of the Holy Spirit, whereby they are sealed to the Day of Redemption; the other External, which is Baptism, by which we are distinguished from *Turks*, *Jews*, and other Infidels; but beside these we acknowledge no other Character. Nothing now, I think, can be plainer than this, that the Indelible Character, so much contended for by the *Romanists*, is a meer Fiction, and contrary both to the Sense of the Protestants, and the Doctrine of the Primitive Church; which both allow an Indelible Character, as that signifies the outward Form of Baptism or Form of Ordination, that needs not be Repeated; but utterly deny any other Character imprinting a Spiritual Power on the Soul of a Priest, whereby he is Authorized to perform

M

<sup>r</sup> *Riissenius*, *Compend. Theologiæ Turvetin.* Loc. 17. p. 242. Pontificii docent Characterem esse signum spirituale & Indelibile impressum, sive in Animæ substantia, sive in ejus Potentiis, vi & efficacia trium Sacramentorum, Baptismi, Confirmationis, & Ordinis; & hanc volunt esse causam, propter quam hæc tria Sacramenta non sunt iteranda, quod nempe imprimant Characterem indelebilem. --- Nos tale Commentum rejicimus, & dicimus, Fideles duplex habere sigillum, internum unum, nimirum Spiritum Sanctum, quo ob signantur in diem redemptionis; alterum externum, nimirum Baptismum, quo distinguimur à Turcis, Judæis, & aliis Infidelibus; sed nullum alium Characterem agnoscimus.



form Sacerdotal Offices perpetually, notwithstanding any Deposition or Excommunication. The Protestants are so far from allowing this, that some of them think an Ordination may, without Sacrilege, be repeated: So *Calvin*, *Kemnitius*, *Alting*, *Balduin*; and it is observable, that at *Geneva*, they repeat the Ceremony of Ordination upon the Removal of a Minister from one Church to another, as I have had occasion to shew formerly in a Discourse<sup>s</sup> of another Nature. And they who do not think this either necessary or convenient, or that even an Apostate or Heretical Priest should be restored to his Office by a New Ordination, do not yet maintain that a Man is an Authorized Priest, after he is totally Degraded from his Office by the Authority of the Church; but that the Church has Power to take away all Sacerdotal Authority from such a Delinquent Priest, if she sees it necessary, and reduce him to the State of a Layman; and that this was actually the Discipline and Practice of the Primitive Church in many Cases; as I have represented it, I hope, to the Satisfaction of all Ingenuous Readers, and the Conviction of some of my erring Brethren, who perhaps would more edify the Church, if they would bear a Part with me in carefully Studying and Explaining the ancient Discipline of the Church, instead of Entangling themselves and others with the perplex and intricate, and sometimes dangerous, Notions of the Schoolmen. *Chamier*, I am sure, makes no scruple to affirm, That, by the Discipline of the ancient Church, a Criminal Priest might

<sup>s</sup> See French Churches Apology for the Church of England, in the Conclusion. P. 335.



might be Degraded from his Order, and be made a Layman. For explaining the ancient Notion of Reducing Clerks to Lay-Communion, (which *Bellarmin* and some others ignorantly understand of Communion only in one kind, according to the Modern Phrase) he says, "It was so denominated neither from the Place, nor from the Species, nor from the Time, but from the Person that received it, because he that before was a Clerk and in the Nomenclature of Clerks, was now a Layman and in the Order of Laymen." Upon the whole matter then, we now see clearly, that according to the ancient Church, and in the Opinion of Protestants, a Criminal Clerk might be Degraded from his Order, and be made a Layman, notwithstanding the Popish Pretence of an Indelible Character imprinting a Spiritual Power on his Soul, which the ancient Church knew nothing of, and the Protestant Schools reject and refute as a Novel Invention. The Consequence of all which is, That a Clerk, so Degraded, is no longer an Authorized Priest, or Publick Minister of the Catholick Church, but a Private Man in the Order of Laymen: And all Hereticks and Schismaticks, that are Formally Degraded by the Church, are in this Predicament, that is, in the Order and Quality of Laymen; only with this Difference, that if the Church, in any great Exigency, thought fit to recal them to their former Station, she did not think it necessary to give them a new Ordination;

M 2

*Chamier. Panstrat. Tom. 4. de Eucharist. Lib. 9. cap. 3. n. 33. p. 487.* Appellatam fuisse Laicam Communionem, non à Loco, non à speciebus, non à Tempore, sed à Persona: Nimirum quod qui ante fuerit Clericus, sive in Clericorum Nomenclatura, nunc fit Laicus, & in Ordine Laicorum.



nation; but only a new Commission or Authority, which they wanted before. And yet she never Rebaptized such as were in due Form Baptized by these Men, in their Unauthorized State. From whence it plainly follows, that she received the Baptism of Unauthorized Laymen, because she received the Baptism of those whom she herself made Laymen, by taking all Clerical Authority from them. Which was the thing I designed to shew. And how solidly and fairly, without any Artifice or Sophistry, but the plain Dint of Historical Truth, I have proved this beyond Exception, I now leave to the Judgment of every Impartial Reader; only repeating the Argument once more in Form for Memories sake.

The Baptism of Deposed Hereticks, and Schismatics, and Degraded Clerks, and Excommunicated Clerks, is the Baptism of Unauthorized Persons, either made Laymen, or set one Degree below Laymen, according to the general Sense of the Catholick Church.

But the Baptism of such Deposed Hereticks, and Schismatics, and Degraded Clerks, and Excommunicated Clerks, if ministred in due Form, was always received by the Catholick Church without Rebaptizing.

Therefore the Baptism of Unauthorized Persons, Laymen, or one Degree below Laymen, if ministred in due Form, was always received by the Catholick Church without Rebaptizing.

The first Proposition in this Argument has been fully made out in this Discourse; and the second Proposition, in the former Part of this History, even to the Satisfaction and Content of the Adversaries themselves, who have nothing to object against it. And if both the

Premi-



Premises stand good, it will be impossible to shake the Conclusion.

All I shall add farther in this Chapter, is only a reasonable and useful Reflexion on what has hitherto been said, in Relation to the Opinion and Judgment of the Catho-  
§. 7.  
What submission is due to the Judgment of the Catholick Church, in such Points of Discipline as Rebaptizing and Reordaining.

*viz.* That a great Deference is due to her Wisdom and Authority in all such Controverted Points of Discipline, as those of Rebaptization and Reordination of Hereticks and Schismaticks and other Unauthorized Laymen, both because they are Matters of Discipline, and because they seem not to be so fully and expressly determined in Scripture. The Council of Nice ordered the *Meletians* to be Reordained, but the *Novatians* and *Donatists* were received without it: And yet the Ordinations of the *Meletians* were as good as the *Donatists*, and something more Canonical than the *Novatians*: But it became every private Man to comply with these different Determinations, and not break or disturb the Peace and Communion of the Church upon either Account, but to submit to her Authority and Wisdom in both, as presuming she had good Reasons and Authority in both Cases to order Matters as she judged most conducing to the common Interest of the Publick. So if she had Determined, that all Persons baptized by Hereticks, or Schismaticks, or other Unauthorized Laymen, should have been Rebaptized, I think every wise and good Man ought to have complied with this Rule of Discipline, rather than break Communion upon it: But since she has at all



times determined the contrary, I judge it no small Crime, at this time of Day, for any Private Man to oppose his own Sentiments to the common Sense and Practice of the Universal Church, which can have no other Effect but to raise a Flame, and disturb her Peace, and fill Mens Heads with endless Scruples about their Baptism. If it were not for the Apprehension of such Mischiefs, I would never have given myself the trouble to have made such a laborious Search into the ancient Discipline and Practice of the Church upon this Head: And I think it now high time to put an end to such a Dispute, after all things have been so fully discussed and set in so fair a Light, that have any Relation to it. And therefore I intend to take my leave of this Subject, if the Adverse Party will suffer me to go on quietly with a more necessary Work, (in which I have already made some Progress, and I hope not without general Benefit and Satisfaction to the Church) as soon as I have resolved a few Difficulties, concerning the Ordinations, Baptisms, and Communion of Hereticks, which may perhaps fall in the way of an Intelligent Reader.

CHAP.



CHAP. VII.

*A Resolution of some Difficulties concerning the Communion of Hereticks, and their Baptisms and Ordinations.*

**T**HE first Difficulty may arise concerning holding Communion with Heretical Priests. For if, according to the Doctrine of the Ancients, they be not true Authorized Priests, but only Laymen, or a Degree below Laymen; then it seems unlawful to hold Communion with them in any Ministerial Acts whatsoever. And yet in two Cases there seems almost a Necessity to do it. 1. When they are not yet fully Discovered or Censured by the Church. 2. When a whole Church is turned Heretical, and there are no other but such Priests to hold Communion with. The first of these Cases has no great Difficulty in it: For the Ancients allow, that till Hereticks be fully Manifested, Convicted, and Censured by the Church, Men may innocently Communicate with them. The Case often happens to be, as it was in the Struglings of the *Arian* Heresy: Hereticks pretend to be Catholics, and shelter themselves under Catholick Terms, and profess their Faith in the same Creeds and Form of Words as Catholics do, at

S. I.  
*Whether it be lawful to hold Communion with Heretical Priests before they be degraded.*



the same time that they put an Equivocal and Heretical Sense upon them. This was the subtle Artifice of the Politick *Arians*, called *Eusebians*, from their Ringleader *Eusebius*, Bishop of *Nicomedia*, all the Time of *Constantine*, and of some of them in the Time of *Constantius*. They durst not oppose the Council of *Nice* formally and directly, and therefore they used her Creed, and spake and taught as other Catholics did, in the Form of sound Words, and contented themselves to put their own Private Heretical Sense upon them. Nay, many of them, when they had got the Word *Consubstantial*, thrown out of the Creed in the Time of *Constantius*, under pretence of Peace, durst not yet, in plain Terms, propose the *Arian* Blasphemies to the People, but spake in Scripture Terms, and Words seemingly expressing the Catholick Faith, which the People understood only in the true genuine Catholick Sense, whilst they had their own Fallacious and Insidious Meaning to put upon them. Now tho' these Men were Hereticks before God, yet they were not so in the Eye of the People, who honestly took them to mean as they spake, without any Fraudulent Sense or Equivocation. And so long the People were thought excusable in holding Communion with them, because they did not Communicate with them in their Errors, but Intentionally only in the Catholick Faith. But when the Hereticks were once plainly detected and convicted, then it was no longer lawful for the People to join with them, but to fly from them as Wolves in Sheeps Cloathing, and avoid them as Ministers of Antichrist, and Angels of Satan, who, by a Diabolical Subtilty and Malice, only transformed themselves into Angels



gels of Light. This is the Resolution which St. Hilary gives of this Difficulty, with a particular respect to the Case of *Auxentius*, the *Arian* Bishop of *Milan*, and *Ursatius*, and *Valens*, who pretended to speak Orthodoxly, and professed their Faith in such Terms, as seemed to carry in them nothing but the ancient Catholick Doctrine; but they had an Insidious Meaning, which the Innocent People could not always discover: "They ascribed to CHRIST, says "*Hilary*<sup>a</sup>, the Name of GOD, because this was "<sup>also given to Men. They confessed him to "<sup>be truly the Son of GOD, but only as every "<sup>one else is made truly the Son of GOD, by "<sup>the Sacrament of Baptism. They allowed "<sup>him to be before Time and Ages, because "<sup>this may be said of Angels and the Devil. "<sup>So in reality they ascribed nothing more "<sup>to CHRIST the Lord, than what was proper "<sup>to Men or Angels. His peculiar Property they</sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup></sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Hilar. cont. Auxentium. p. 102.* Tribuunt Christo Dei nomen, quia hoc & hominibus fit tributum. Fatentur Dei verè Filium, quia Sacramento baptismi verè Dei filius unusquisque perficitur. Ante tempora & sæcula confitentur, quod de Angelis & Diabolo est non negatum. Ita Domino Christo sola illa tribuuntur, quæ sunt vel Angelorum propria vel nostra. Caterum quod Deo Christo legitimum & verum est, Christus Deus verus, id est, eadem esse Filii quæ Patris Divinitas, denegatur. Et hujus quidem usque adhuc Impietatis occasio per fraudem perficitur. Ut jam sub Antichristi Sacerdotibus Christi populus non occidat, dum hoc putant illi Fidei esse, quod vocis est. Audiunt Deum Christum, putant esse quod dicitur. Audiunt Filium Dei, putant in Dei Nativitate inesse Filii veritatem. Audiunt ante tempora, putant id ipsum ante tempora esse quod semper est. Sanctiores sunt aures Plebis quam corda Sacerdotum.



“they denied, That he was CHRIST the true  
 “GOD, that is, of the same Divintiy with the  
 “Father. But all this Impiety was for a long  
 “time coloured over, and carried on by Fraud  
 “and Artifice. And so it happened that the  
 “People of CHRIST were not mortally hurt  
 “under the Priests of Antichrist, whilst they  
 “thought their Faith and Meaning had been  
 “agreeable to their Words. They heard  
 “CHRIST called GOD, and they supposed  
 “him to be truly so. They heard him called  
 “the Son of GOD, and they thought the ve-  
 “rity of a Son was implied in the Nativity  
 “of GOD. They heard him said to be before  
 “all Time, and they thought that being be-  
 “fore all Time was the same thing as being  
 “Eternal. So the Peoples Ears were much  
 “more Pious than the Hearts of the Priests.”  
 Thus far therefore they Communicated with  
 the Hereticks, supposing them to be Orthodox  
 and Sincere according to their outward Ex-  
 pressions. But when once it was made ap-  
 pear to them, that they were Hereticks indeed,  
 then Hilary tells them, “they ought no longer  
 “to Communicate with them as Ministers of  
 “CHRIST, but to avoid them as Antichrists,  
 “as Angels of Satan, as Enemies of CHRIST,  
 “as Devils, though by the Emperor’s Favour,  
 “they were in Possession of the Churches.  
 “They should not be so much in love with  
 “Walls

ibi Hilary. *ibid.* in fine. Unum moneo cavere Antichri-  
 stum. Male enim vos parietum amor cepit, male Ecclesiam  
 Dei in tectis ædificiisque veneramini, male sub his Pacis no-  
 men ingeritis. Atque ambiguum est Antichristum in his esse  
 Sessurum?



"Walls and Buildings, as to think the true  
 "Church of GOD was confined to them, and  
 "for their sakes have Peace with the *Arians*.  
 "For Antichrist himself was to sit within the  
 "Walls of the Church. So that Mountains,  
 "and Woods, and Lakes, and Prisons, where  
 "the Prophets of GOD were cast, were safer  
 "Places than the Buildings of the Church in  
 "such a Condition. Therefore depart, says  
 "he, from *Auxentius*, that Angel of Satan,  
 "that Enemy of CHRIST, that wicked De-  
 "stroyer, that Denyer of the Faith, which he  
 "made Profession of before the Emperor, in  
 "such a manner as to deceive him, and so de-  
 "ceived him as to blaspheme CHRIST. Let  
 "him gather as many Synods as he pleases  
 "against me; Let him Proscribe me as an  
 "Heretick by Publick Titles, as he has often  
 "done already; Let him stir up the Anger  
 "of Great Men as much as he will against  
 "me; yet he shall never be any better, in  
 "my Opinion, than a Devil, because he is an  
 "*Arian*. Nor will I ever desire to be at  
 "Peace

Sessurum? Montes mihi & Sylva, & Lacus, & Carceres, &  
 Voragines sunt tutiores: In his enim Prophetae, aut ma-  
 nentes, aut demersi, Dei Spiritu prophetabant. Absistite  
 itaque ab Auxentio Satanæ Angelo, Hoste Christi, Vastatore  
 perditio, Fidei negatore, quam sic est Regi professus, ut  
 falleret: Sic fefellit, ut blasphemaret. Congreget nunc  
 ille quas volet in me Synodos, & hæreticum me, ut sæpe  
 jam fecit, publico Titulo proscribat, & quam volet iram  
 Potentium moliatur: mihi certe ille nunquam aliud quam  
 Diabolus erit, quia Arianus est. Neque Pax aliquorum un-  
 quam optabitur, nisi eorum qui secundum Patrum nostro-  
 rum apud Nicæam tractatum, anathematizatis Arianis,  
 Christum Deum verum prædicabunt.



“Peace with any but those, who, according  
 “to the Rule of the *Nicene* Fathers, anathe-  
 “matize the *Arians*, and preach CHRIST to  
 “be the true GOD.” By this one Instance,  
 (to which I could add many more) it is  
 easy to judge, how far it was deemed Inno-  
 cent to hold Communion with Undetected  
 Hereticks, and where the Bounds of that  
 Communion end, *viz.* when Hereticks open-  
 ly declare themselves, and are Convicted of  
 their Errors against the Catholick Faith, then  
 they were no longer to be Communicated  
 with as Priests of GOD, but to be avoided  
 as the Priests of Antichrist, as Angels of Sa-  
 tan, as Destroyers of the Faith, with whom  
 no Peace could safely be maintained, though  
 they were in Possession of the Churches.

S. 2.  
*Whether it be  
 lawful to Communi-  
 cate with Hereticks,  
 when a whole Church  
 is Heretical.*

But what if the whole  
 Church should turn Hereticks,  
 would it be lawful in that case  
 to Communicate with them?  
 I answer, If by the whole  
 Church, be understood the  
 whole Catholick Church, the Supposition is  
 not to be allowed. For the whole Catho-  
 lick Church never was totally involved in  
 any damnable Heresy. In the greatest Pre-  
 valency of the *Arian* Faction the whole  
 Church was far from being overspread with  
 that Error, as a Learned Person has undenia-  
 bly demonstrated against those that suppose it.  
 And it is but a vulgar Error, to say, That the Coun-



Council of *Ariminum* was a Council of *Arian* Bishops, or that the whole World upon that turned *Arian*: For tho' St. *Ferom's* Testimony be commonly alledged for that, yet I have had occasion heretofore<sup>d</sup> to shew the contrary from St. *Ferom* himself, who vindicates the Bishops of *Ariminum*, as Catholick Bishops, but only insidiously imposed upon by *Ursatius* and *Valens*, the same that St. *Hilary* complains of, who pretended to be true Catholicks, and offered a Catholick Creed to the Council, which they subscribed in a Catholick Sense, though the subtil *Arians* put their own Fraudulent and Equivocal Sense upon it. Which, as soon as the Catholick Bishops understood, they declared their Abhorrence of the Fraud, and utterly detested their Communion. Which is a more pregnant Evidence still, that the Face of the whole Catholick Church was never totally overspread with *Arianism*. Nor can it be shewed, that in the darkest times of Popery the whole Catholick Church was sunk into the Dregs of Popish Errors: For, to say nothing of the *Eastern* Churches, which never came under the *Romish* Yoke and Tyranny, I have made it appear, in the First Part of this *Scholastical History*, that there were sufficient numbers among the *Albigenses*, which never subscribed or fell in with the *Romish* Idolatry and Corruptions. And I do not find any of my Opposers inclined to call this in Question. So that the Supposition of the whole Catholick Church's having, at any time, fall'n into

Dam-

<sup>d</sup> Origin. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 3. n. 10. p. 355.



Damnable Heresy, is a Supposition in Fact without any Foundation. But if by the whole Church, be meant only the Aggregate Body of some Particular Church, as that of *Rome*, then there is no absurdity in supposing, that such a whole Church may fall into Damnable Heresy: And if the Question then be, Whether it was Lawful to join in Communion with such an Heretical Church? It will easily be resolved by the foresaid Answer of *St. Hilary*: If Men are not well apprized of any Heresies maintained in such a Church, so far her Communion may be Innocent to them, as the Communion of those *Arian* Bishops was to the Catholics that *Hilary* mentions: But if they are known Heresies, the Communion of Heretical Priests is to be avoided, and Catholick Communion to be preserved with the rest of the Church in a Spiritual Union with them, when a Man has no Opportunity Corporally to join with them. But if Men, thro' Invincible Ignorance, join in an Heretical Communion, which they, thro' want of Judgment, suppose still to be Orthodox and Innocent, as perhaps it was the Case of many in the dark times of Popery, and may be so still in many Countries, where nothing but Popery is professed; what Allowances God will make for such honest Ignorance, is best known to himself, and it belongs not to us positively to determine. The Church always made a Distinction betwixt Heresiarchs and their Followers; between the Guides and the People; and between such as were born and bred in the Church, and afterwards Apostatized into Heresy, and those that received their Errors from the Tradition and

Se-



Seduction of their Parents. Infomuch that St. *Austin* goes so far in his great Charity, as to say, "That they who defend e a False and Perverse Opinion without any Pertinacious Animosity, especially if by any Audacious Presumption of their own they did not first invent it, but received it from the Seduction of their erring Parents, and are careful in their Enquiries after Truth, being ready to embrace it when they find it, such Men are not to be reckoned among Hereticks." He means, I suppose, they have not the Formality of Heresy in them, Pride and Obstinacy, as commonly the first Seducers have, and therefore they may, perhaps, find Favour with G O D, who knows the Sincerity of their Hearts, and we may judge Charitably of them, at the same time that we do not think it Lawful to join in Communion with them.

The next Difficulty may arise concerning the desiring of Baptism from the Hands of an Heretical Priest, where a Catholick cannot be found to do it. Shall a Man, in that Case, rather die without Baptism, than receive it from the Hands of such a Priest? §. 3.

*Whether, in any Case, it be Lawful to desire the Baptism of Hereticks.*

The

e *Aug. Ep. 162. ad Episc. Donat. p. 277.* Qui sententiam suam quamvis falsam atque perversam nulla pertinaci animositate defendunt, præsertim quam non audacia præsumptionis suæ pepererunt, sed à seductis atque in errorem lapsis Parentibus acceperunt, quærunt autem cauta sollicitudine veritatem, corrigi parati cum invenerint, nequaquam sunt inter Hæreticos deputandi.



The Question has no Difficulty at all in Ordinary Cases: For the ancient Rule was very plain, That where a Catholick Priest might be had, no Man might have Recourse to a known Heretick<sup>f</sup> under Pain of Excommunication. If it be said, That *Constantine* was Baptized by *Eusebius* Bishop of *Nicomedia*, who was an *Arian*. I answer, That *Eusebius* professed himself a Catholick all the time that *Constantine* lived, and he durst do no otherwise, for fear of Banishment: So that *Constantine* did not desire Baptism of him but only upon Presumption of his being a Catholick; and if *Eusebius* prevaricated and was a secret Heretick, that was nothing to *Constantine*, who judged him to be a Catholick, and, in the Simplicity of his Soul, desired Baptism of him as a Catholick, and not as an *Arian*. For otherwise it is not to be imagined, that a Person so zealous against *Arianism* as *Constantine*, would ever have submitted to have been Baptized by an *Arian*, so much against the Rule of the Church, in an Ordinary Case, when many other Catholick Bishops might as easily have been procured to do it. But the Difficulty of the Question is in Cases of Extremity, when a Man is born or lives in a Country, where there are none but Hereticks, and must either die without Baptism, or receive it from them: What is to be done in such an Exigency?

---

<sup>f</sup> Conc. Ilerdens. can. 13. Catholicus qui filios suos in haeresi Baptizandos obtulerit, Oblatio illius in Ecclesia nullatenus recipiatur. Vide. Hieron. cont. Lucifer. cap. 5.



gency? St. *Austin* resolves this Case plainly, without any Hesitation, "That if a Man  
" is & compelled by Extreme Necessity, where  
" he cannot have a Catholick to give him  
" Baptism, to take it at the Hands of one  
" who is not in Catholick Unity; in that  
" Case he should be reckoned as a Catholick,  
" though he died immediately, because he  
" was in Heart and Mind a Catholick, and  
" would have been Baptized in Catholick  
" Unity, if there had been any Opportunity  
" to have done it. If such an one lives, and  
" Corporally joins himself to the Catholick  
" Congregation, from whence in Heart he  
" never departed, we not only not disallow  
" what he has done, but securely and truly  
" commend him for it: because he believed  
" GOD

g *Aug. de Bapt. Lib. I. c. 2.* Si quem forte coegerit extrema necessitas, ubi Catholicum per quem accipiat non invenerit, & in animo pace Catholica custodita, per aliquem extra Catholicam Unitatem acceperit, quod erat in ipsa Catholica Unitate accepturus, si statim etiam de hac vita migraverit, non eum nisi Catholicum deputamus. Si autem fuerit à Corporali morte liberatus, cum se Catholica Congregationi etiam corporali præsentia reddiderit, unde nunquam corde discesserat, non solum non improbamus quod fecit, sed etiam securissime verissimeque laudamus: Quia præsentem Deum credidit cordi suo, ubi Unitatem servabat, & sine sancti baptismi sacramento, quod ubicunque invenit, non hominum sed Dei esse cognovit, noluit ex hac vita migrare. Si quis autem cum possit in ipsa Catholica accipere, per aliquam mentis perversitatem, eligit in Schismate baptizari, etiam si postea venire ad Catholicam cogitat, quia certus est ibi prodesse Sacramentum, quod alibi accipi quidem potest, prodesse autem non potest: Proculdubio perversus & iniquus est, & tanto perniciosius quanto scientius.



" God to be present in his Heart, where  
 " he preserved Unity, and would not depart  
 " out of this Life without the Sacrament of  
 " Baptism, which he knows to be God's,  
 " and not Mens, wheresoever he finds it.  
 " But if any one, when he might receive it  
 " in the Catholick Church, by some Per-  
 " verseness of Mind, chuses rather to be  
 " Baptized in Schism, though he afterward  
 " design to return to the Church, because  
 " he is certain the Sacrament will profit him  
 " in the Church, but not elsewhere, though  
 " he may receive it elsewhere: This is a Per-  
 " verse and Wicked Man, and so much the  
 " more perniciously so, by how much the  
 " more knowing he is." St. *Austin* gives  
 the same Resolution <sup>h</sup> in Case a Man re-  
 ceives Baptism from a Schismatick in extreme  
 Necessity at the Point of Death: " This Bap-  
 " tism is advantageous to him, because he  
 " receives it with a Heart and Mind never  
 " separated from the Catholick Unity of the  
 " Church: Whether he lives or dies, he is  
 " spiritually in the Church, and therefore his  
 " Baptism is of advantage to him." So that  
 Cases of Necessity make many things Inno-  
 cent and Allowable, which in ordinary Cases  
 are strictly prohibited by the Laws of God  
 and Man. The Resolution of this Case may per-

<sup>h</sup> *Aug. de Bapt. Lib. 6. c. 5.* Potest salubriter accipere  
 à separato, si ipse non separatus accipiat: Sicut plerisque  
 accidit, ut Catholico animo & corde ab Unitate Pacis non  
 alienato, aliqua necessitate mortis urgentis in aliquem Hæ-  
 reticum irruerent, & ab eo Christi baptismum sine illius  
 perversitate perciperent, &c. *Vid. Lib. 7. c. 52.*



perhaps be of some use to all such, who are Baptized in Countries where the Church is overrun with Heresy or Schism; and to those who are Baptized in Infancy, by the Force of their Parents carrying them to Hereticks or Schismaticks for Baptism, when they might have had it in the Church: Though the Parents cannot plead Necessity in that Case, yet the Children perhaps may be allowed to do it; and the Church accept their Plea, when they detest their Parents Iniquity, and return unfeignedly to the Unity of the Catholick Church.

The last and greatest Difficulties seem to be about the Ordinations of Hereticks and Schismaticks, and such Degraded Bishops as are divested of their Authority to Ordain. For if they are not

S. 4.  
*Whether the Ordinations of Hereticks and Schismaticks may be accepted by the Church without Reordaining.*

true Authorized Ministers in that State, but, at the best, only in Lay-Communion; as they have no Authority to Baptize, so neither can they have any just Authority, in such a State, to Ordain. But then the Question is, What if they do Ordain in such a State? Of what Force are their Ordinations? How did the Church receive pretended Clerks so Ordained? Did she wholly disannul their Ordinations, and give them a new Ordination, or only supply what was Deficient in them, by adding her own Authority and Confirmation? To this, I answer, The Church used her Liberty in this Matter, to receive or reject such Ordinations, as she thought ex-



pedient, and judged most necessary in the present Exigency of Affairs. She received the Ordinations of the *Novatians* and the *Donatists*, without Reordaining, at the same time that she rejected the Ordinations of the *Meletians*, and would admit none of their Clergy to Officiate in the Church without a new Ordination. And yet *Meletius*, the Father of the *Meletians*, was once a Regular Archbishop in the Church, if that had been sufficient to have given a perpetual Authority to his Ordinations: But *Novatian*, the Father of the *Novatians*, and *Majorinus* the first Founder of the *Donatists*, were never truly Ordained Bishops in the Church, and consequently never had true and Lawful Authority to Ordain others. There must therefore needs be some other Reason, why the Church was more favourable in the Case of the *Novatians* and *Donatists*, than she was in that of the *Meletians*: For it could not be because the Ordinations of the *Novatians* and *Donatists* were Originally more Authentick than the other, since it appears, from the Observation I have made upon the History of both, that they were rather less Authentick, as descending from those who were never Ordained themselves true Bishops in the Church. But the truth of the matter seems to be this, The Church never esteemed any of these three Sects to be Lawful Ministers, either Bishops, Priests, or Deacons, but only in the Condition of Laymen, according to the Rules and Discipline of the Church then prevailing; but because they retained the Outward Form of Ordination, as they did the Outward Form of



of Baptism, though they had no Authority to give the one more than the other, the Church used her Liberty, either to reject their Ordinations wholly, or to confirm them by her own Authority, as she judged expedient for the Reclaiming those Sects, or promoting her own Welfare and Peace, as the exigency of the Case required. Therefore she rejected the Ordinations of the *Meletians*, and would admit none of them to officiate in the Church, till they had received a new Ordination; because the *Meletians* had joined Interest with the *Arians*, and deserved a more severe Censure. And they were but an upstart Sect, not inveterately rooted, nor far spread, and therefore might more easily be obliged to submit to the Churches Discipline. But the *Novatians* and *Donatists* never sided with the *Arians*, but generally joined with the Church in opposing them, and therefore the Church was a little more inclined to shew Favour to them. Besides, they were become firm and inveterate Sects, which had spread themselves in many Parts of the World, and gained great Strength, so that there was little hopes of Reducing them by the Strictness and Exactness of Discipline: Therefore the Church, in this Exigency, to regain them more Universally, thought it most conducing to the Publick Interest of Religion to abate something of the Rigour of her own Discipline upon this Occasion, which otherwise would not have been allowed, but only for the sake of Peace. For, in Strictness of Discipline, no one Ordained or Baptized by Hereticks was ever to be admitted to Clerical Dignity



nity in the Church, either by vertue of his former Ordination, or by a new one: But, for Prudential Reasons, the Church sometimes dispensed with these Rules, and admitted some by a new Ordination and some without it, but both the one and the other by a new Commission and Authority, which they had not, nor could have in Herefy or Schism: For out of the Church there was no just Authority either to Baptize or to Ordain, as has been abundantly proved before; but the Authentick Performance of these things belonged only to the Ministers of the Church. If it be asked, How the Church could admit such to Officiate without a new Ordination? I answer, Upon the same Ground that she admitted them without a new Baptism: For the Outward Form of Ordination had been given them before, tho' by Persons who had no Authority to give it: And, though no just Authority could be conveyed by such Unauthorized Ordainers, yet the Church did not think fit, in such Exigencies, always to Repeat the Outward Form of Ordination, but only supplied what was Deficient in it, by her own just Authority and Commission granted to them; which was thought sufficient to Compleat an Unauthorized and Incompleat Ordination, as the Unction of Chrism or Imposition of Hands in Confirmation, was thought sufficient to Compleat an Unauthorized and Incompleat Baptism. But why then did not the Church observe this Method in receiving all Hereticks to Clerical Dignity, without a new Ordination? Why did she not admit the *Meletians* and others without Reordaining, as well as the *Novatians* and *Dona-*  
*tists?*



*tists*? I answer, Because this was matter of Prudence and Discretion, and the Church used her Authority and just Liberty, in dispensing her Commission to others, out of the Church, in such a manner, as she in her Wisdom judged most convenient for the Reduction of Hereticks, and Preservation of her own Peace; which are the great Ends to be aimed at in all parts of Ecclesiastical Discipline: And it is but fair to let the Church judge for herself, what is fittest to be done in all such Cases. And if Men would consent in Modesty to be guided by this Rule, we shall need Dispute no longer about Rebaptizing those who are Baptized by Unauthorized Baptism, whether administered by Hereticks or other Laymen, since this has been so fully determined by the Universal Consent and Practice of the Catholick Church, in her first Six General Councils, and all others that have said any thing upon the Subject, except those of the *Cyprianick* Age, which are no Balance against the Counterpoise-Judgment of the Church in all Ages.

AN



As I answer, Because this was matter of  
 Prudence and Discretion, and the Church ruled  
 her Authority and that Liberty, in dispensing  
 her Communion to others, out of the Church,  
 in such a manner, as she in her Wisdom judged  
 most convenient for the Reduction of Heretics,  
 and Preservation of her own Peace; which  
 are the great Ends to be aimed at in all parts of  
 Ecclesiastical Discipline: And it is but fair to  
 suppose, that the Church in this, where it is  
 to be done in all such Cases, and all Men  
 would consent in modestly to be guided by this  
 Rule, we shall need no longer about  
 Respecting those who are Baptized by Unau-  
 thorized Baptism, whether administered by He-  
 reticks or other Laymen, since this has been  
 so fully determined by the Universal Councils  
 and Practice of the Catholic Church, in her  
 first Six General Councils, and all others that  
 have said any thing upon the Subject, except  
 those of the Reformation Age, which are no Bal-  
 lance against the Counterpoise Judgment of  
 the Church in all Ages.  
 of the ancient Discipline of the Church,  
 which she supposed to be ancient and  
 to be the Authority of the Church, and  
 Commission, when the Church had re-  
 voked them to the State of Laymen.  
 and she had limited the foregoing  
 Discourse, where came to my  
 hands an Anonymous Letter  
 called, The Second Remonstrance  
 Baptism in such, wherein the Author pretends to



---

AN  
APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

*Some Remarks on the Author  
of the Second Part of Lay-  
Baptism Invalid.*

---

CHAP. I.

*A short Way to end the Controversy with  
this Author about Unauthorized Bap-  
tism, by shewing his great Ignorance  
of the ancient Discipline of the Church,  
whilst he supposes the ancient Hereticks  
to be true Authorized Priests in Actual  
Commission, when the Church had re-  
duced them to the state of Laymen.*

**W**HEN I had finished the foregoing  
Discourse, there came to my  
hands an Anonymous Treatise,  
called, *The Second Part of Lay-  
Baptism Invalid*: wherein the Author pretends to  
shew,



shew, That the Ancient Catholick Church never had any Ecclesiastical Law, Tradition, or Custom for the Validity of Baptisms performed by Persons who never were commissioned by Bishops to baptize; All proved from Mr. Bingham's *Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism*, and from other Evidences not produced by that Historian. I must no longer call this Author by the Name of Mr. Lawrence, for he is very angry at my Incivility, (as he pleases to term it) for doing so before; when yet I thought no harm in doing that, which his greatest Friends do every Day, and speak of him in all Publick Places of Concourse, with a Design to honour him under that Appellation and Distinction. But the Gentleman is out of Humour with me upon other Reasons, and therefore takes any Occasion to express his Anger and Resentments against me, for being really so uncivil as to pretend to understand Ecclesiastical History, and the Discipline of the Church better than himself, and for being a little too free in correcting his Mistakes, and exposing the dangerous Consequences and Absurdities of some of his Opinions. But however it be, I will neither trouble myself nor the Reader any farther about his Name, but stick to the Merits of his Cause, and shew him that he has made as gross a Mistake about the Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church (after all his Pretences to Councils and Fathers, and the general Assistance of all his Friends) as when he said, *A Major Proposition was a Minor or an Assumption*: And therefore if he will be but as Ingenuous in Retracting one plain Error as another, our Controversy will be at an end, and he will trouble the World no more with such tedious Accounts of Ancient History, to so little purpose.

I will



I will not say of him as he says of his Learned Adversaries (in his *Preface*, pag. 2.) "That if they make false Arguments to defend Error, he shall not esteem such their Methods to be only Mistakes, but something worse, considering the greatness of their Knowledge.," I have more Charity for him than this comes to, tho' he has so little for others; and believe, that when he turned a Minor Proposition into a Major, and thereby made *Lucifer* a Witness to an Assertion which he never dreamt of, that it was only an Undesigned Mistake: But yet there are two things which I cannot but a little wonder at, 1. That so Learned and Acute a Man as Dr. Hicks, should carefully read over his Papers and never observe such an heap of Blunders, till an Adversary came more kindly to discover them. And, 2. That this Gentleman should be so severe and uncharitable in his Censures of other Mens Intentions, who needs so much Candor and Charity to put a favourable Construction upon his own. For any Man's Knowledge is great enough to transcribe aright the Words of an English Writer; and if he transcribes them wrong in favour of his own Opinion, would not an Untoward Critick, of an ill-dispos'd Temper, be apt to suspect the worst, and uncharitably construe it to be something more than a Mistake, when outwardly it bears such a Face of an ill Design to impose upon his Readers? Now if this Gentleman would not be pleased to have base Suggestions insinuated against himself, he ought to have so much Candor and Charity, as not Causelessly to insinuate the like against others, and represent them as Abettors of Hereticks and Schismatics, and of those who would dissolve and take away the Necessity of the Christian



Priesthood, and of CHRIST's Authority here on Earth, (and of all Revealed Religion too; which are his kind Suggestions in the end of his Preface, *pag.* 21. concerning the Principles of those, who only labour to defend the Principles and Practices of the Catholick Church against his own Heterodoxies and Novelties in Opinion. Some of these Learned Men he thus Characterizes, have been as zealous Opposers of Hereticks and Schismatics, and written as Learnedly and Judiciously in Defence of the Christian Priesthood, and CHRIST's Authority on Earth, and Revealed Religion, as either he or any of his Assistants can pretend to do: But something, true or false, was to be insinuated against their Integrity, to frighten young Students in Divinity from Reading and Considering their Works, as if he and his Friends were the only Men that could teach them sound Divinity, after 1700 Years Experience. And yet I will give the World a plain Demonstration, that he has said much more for the Honour and Encouragement of Hereticks and Schismatics, and more Dishonourable things against the true Power of the Christian Priesthood, and the Authority of the Church, (which he pretends to be defending) than any of those that have appeared in Defence of the Churches Power and Authority against him.

To come close to the Point, the thing I mean is this: This Author asserts, over and over again, both in his Preface and his Book, That according to the Discipline of the Ancient Church, Hereticks and Schismatics, even when they were cut off and cast out of the Church, were still allowed to be true Authorized and Commissioned Priests, invested with full Power, Authority, and Right to baptize; and that upon  
this



this Principle only the Church allowed of the Validity of their Baptism, because they were then Priests in Commission, and not in the state of Laymen.

Now I affirm and maintain on the contrary, that both these Assertions are as false, as for a Man to say, That Black is White, or, That a Major Proposition is a Minor. And if this Author will please to peruse the foregoing Discourse with any tolerable Ingenuity and Candor, he will receive abundant Satisfaction as to both the Particulars I maintain against him. The Questions are matters of Fact, upon which the whole Controversy turns and depends: *Viz.* Whether Hereticks and Schismatics, under the Censures of the Church, were reputed to be actually Priests in Commission, with full Power, Authority, and Right to baptize; or were not rather deprived of their Commission and Authority, and reduced back again to the State of Laymen? And then, Upon what Foot the Church received the Baptisms of such Men? (For that she received them upon some Foot or other in Fact, there is no dispute); but the Question is, Whether she received them as the Baptisms of true authorized Priests, not deprived of their Commission; or as the Baptisms of usurping Priests, deprived of their Commission, and reduced to the State of Laymen? The determining these Questions of Fact aright will determine the whole Dispute I have with this Author concerning the Sense and Practice of the ancient Church. For if Heretical Priests have no better Title to the true Authority of the Christian Priesthood than Laymen; if they lose the Commission which they once had, by the Censures of the Church,



and are reduced to the State of Laymen ; then, I hope, this Author or any one will own, that the Church, in receiving the Baptisms administered by such Persons, in such a State, received the Baptisms of those whom she esteemed not true Authorized Priests, or Priests in actual Commission, but only Laymen. To quibble now about their once having received a Commission, which other Laymen never had, will here be to no purpose : For if they may forfeit and lose their Commission, then it is the same thing whether they had or had not a Commission ; since their Acts, after they have forfeited their Commission, and are legally deprived of it, are as much Unauthorized and Uncommissioned, as those who never had any Commission at all, that is, the meekest Laymen.

Now then, this is the thing which I will fairly try with this Author, and all his Learned Assistants, to put a short end to this whole Debate, Whether those Heretical and Schismatical Priests, whom the Ancient Church formerly censured and degraded, were, during that Censure and State of Degradation, reputed to have the Authority of true Priests of God, and remain Undeprived of their Commission, notwithstanding the Churches Censure ? This Author affirms it, I absolutely deny it, and will prove my Position to him universally, and in such a manner as he shall not be able to contradict it.

For, first of all, he owns and confesses, without scruple, ( p. 53. ) that all the *Cyprianists* were entirely of this Opinion, “ That Hereticks and “ Schismaticks were but as Laymen ; that they “ had no Power, Authority or Right to baptize.” Thus far we are exactly agreed. The Proofs he has alledged out of *Cyprian* are full and convincing



cing enough, and almost the very same that I have produced in the foregoing Discourse. So that we can never dispute farther about the Opinion of the *Cyprianick* Churches, as to this Particular, Whether Hereticks and Schismaticks, after they are formally censured, be Commissioned Priests, or only Uncommissioned Laymen. When the Church, by her lawful Power, withdraws their Commission, then they are no longer Authorized Priests, but only in the State and Condition of Laymen, because the Church has withdrawn her Authority and Commission from them.

But then this Author pretends, that the other Churches in the *Cyprianick* Age were of a different Opinion, and had a different Discipline; and that the Catholick Church also, in after Ages, had other Sentiments of Heretical and Schismatical Priests, and esteemed them to be actually true Authorized and Commissioned Priests, even when they were under their Errors and the Churches Censures. Now these are our Authors Grand Mistakes, which all the Learning and Assistance of his Party will never clear him of: And I require him either to make good his Assertions (which I am confident he can never do) or else confess his Errors, and put an end to this whole Debate, so far as concerns the History of the Church, and then he may dispute, for me, with whom he pleases. I do not charge him, as he does his Learned Adversaries, with any wicked or designed Mistakes, but reckon he was led into them by the Information and Authority of others, who themselves seem not to have duly considered the exact Discipline of the ancient Catholick Church. For I have made it appear as plain in the foregoing Discourse, as the nature  
of



of any Subject is capable of, as plain as that a Major Proposition is not a Minor, that all the Churches in the World, in *Cyprian's* Time, were entirely of *Cyprian's* Opinion, as to this Particular, That Heretical and Schismatical Priests were not truly and properly Priests (however they might equivocally bear the Name) whilst they were formally under the Churches Censure; but were only treated in the Quality and Condition of Laymen, or less than Laymen, if they were Excommunicated and cast out of the Church. And I have made it farther appear, That the Catholick Church, in after Ages, never departed from this Opinion, if we may judge of her Sense by the Decrees of General or Particular Councils, and the Declarations of Private Fathers, all concurring in the same Opinion. I have shewed *Dr. Brett*, and this Author with him, That *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, writing to *Cyprian*, declares it to be the Sense, the unanimous uncontroverted Sense of all the Bishops in the World, That Criminal Bishops, such as Idolaters and Hereticks, once formally declared and censured, were no longer to be reputed Priests, but Laymen. And if the Catholick Church agreed with them in after Ages, here is as full Consent as can be required in any Case against these Gentlemens Assertions. I will repeat nothing that I have said before, but only add the ample Testimony of *St. Ambrose*, who, in his Books of Repentance, against the *Novatians*, plainly speaks the Sense of the whole Church upon this matter of Sacerdotal Authority and Power; denying the *Novatians* and all other Hereticks to have any Right or Authority to perform any Sacerdotal Acts, such as Binding and Loosing, or Retaining and Forgiving Sins. "For this Power, says he, is  
"per-



“ permitted to the Priests <sup>a</sup> alone. Therefore  
“ the Church rightly claims it, because she has  
“ true Priests: But Heresy cannot claim it, be-  
“ cause it has no Priests of God. And whilst  
“ Heresy cannot claim it, it pronounces Sentence  
“ against itself, that whilst it has no Priests, it  
“ cannot lay claim to Sacerdotal Power.” Can  
any Words be plainer than these, to prove, that  
Hereticks are no true Priests, or Priests of God?  
Or that there are no true Priests but only in the  
Church, however the *Novatians* or other Here-  
ticks might pretend to that Name? Could any  
one more fully or emphatically express himself  
against the *Novatian* Hereticks, if he had a mind  
to say, They were no Priests, because they  
were Hereticks, and consequently could lay  
Claim to no part of the Sacerdotal Authority  
and Power? I shall despair of understanding a-  
ny Man, if this be not the plain Sense of St.  
*Ambrose*.

Now then, I would ask our Author, How  
came it to pass, that the Baptisms given by these  
*Novatians* (who are thus Positively declared to be  
no Priests, nor to have any Sacerdotal Authority  
or Power) came afterward to be received both  
by the great Council of *Nice*, and the whole Ca-  
tholick Church after it, as Valid, so far as not  
to need the outward Form to be repeated by  
Rebaptization? It could not be because they  
were Priests: For they were no Priests, nor in-  
vested

---

<sup>a</sup> Ambros. de Pœnitent. Lib. 1. c. 2. Jus enim hoc solis  
permissum sacerdotibus est. Recte igitur Ecclesia vindicat,  
quæ veros sacerdotes habet; Hæresis vindicare non potest,  
quæ sacerdotes Dei non habet. Non vindicando autem ipsa  
de se pronunciat, quod cum sacerdotes non habeat, jus sibi  
vindicare non debeat sacerdotale.



vested with any Sacerdotal Authority as Priests of GOD, as St. *Ambrose* peremptorily determines. If therefore their Baptism was received as Valid, it is plain, it must be upon some other Reason than their having Sacerdotal Authority, for they had none: And that shews also, that the Authority of the Administrator is not so absolutely Essential to the Outward Form of Baptism, as our Author makes it, in the Opinion of the ancient Church; since they received the Baptisms of those whom they reckoned to be no Priests, nor invested with any Sacerdotal Powers, as is evident in this Case to a Demonstration.

Our Author must now have Recourse to his usual Evasion, by which he can answer a Book in two Words, and say, That St. *Ambrose* here speaks only his own Private Sense of the *Novatians* and other Hereticks, and not the Publick Sense of the Church. But I have already precluded him from this little Subterfuge, by shewing at large, that this was not the Private Sense of St. *Ambrose*, but the Voice of the whole Church; the Sense of the *Cyprianists*, (which he himself owns) and the Sense of *Cornelius* and all the Bishops of the World in the Time of *Cyprian*, who had no Dispute with *Cyprian* upon this Point; the Sense of the *Ante-Nicene* and the *Post-Nicene* Fathers together; the Sense of the Six General Councils, and all the Provincial Councils that have said any thing against Hereticks: They all agree with St. *Ambrose* in this, That Hereticks are no true Priests, or Priests of GOD, nor invested with any Sacerdotal Right, Authority, or Power; but that if they had originally any Commission given them by the Church, investing them with Sacerdotal Authority, they lose that Authority, when the Church withdraws her



her Commission by her Censures. And then it is all one whether ever they had Sacerdotal Authority or not : It is certain they had none by the Discipline of the ancient Church, when once she had recalled her Commission, and taken their Authority from them ; which she thought she had Power and Authority to do : And then in that Case Hereticks had no more Sacerdotal Authority than the meerest Unauthorized Laymen. All this I have made as plain to our Author, as that a Major Proposition is not a Minor ; and therefore I hope he will be as Ingenuous as he was before, and own himself to have made an undesigned Slip, in representing the Discipline of the Ancient Church quite otherwise than it appears to be, and what a Man must shut his Eyes upon, and wink hard, not to be convinced of.

I would not have our Author now quibble with me again, about those who never received any Sacerdotal Commission from Bishops, and say the Case of the ancient Hereticks and these Men is not parallel. For if Men lose the Commission they once had, they have no more Authority by Vertue of that Commission, than they who never had any Commission at all ; and therefore, in this respect, their Case is parallel : The one has no more Sacerdotal Authority than the other ; the only Difference is, that the one never had a Commission or Authority, the other once had it, but afterward forfeited and lost it ; and then they were in the same Condition with those that never had it ; they were equally no Priests, equally destitute of Sacerdotal Power. This our Author owns to have been the Sense of the *Cyprianists* ; and I have shewed him (what he did not apprehend before) that it was also the  
general



general Sense of the whole Catholick Church in all Ages.

Besides, I have observed and proved in the second Chapter of the foregoing Discourse, that the *Novatian* Hereticks, of whom we are now discoursing, never had any real and true Episcopal Ordination among them; their first Founder *Novatian* was only a Nominal and False Bishop, a No-Bishop, by all the Rules and Disciplin of the Catholick Church; whereby his pretended Ordination was disannulled from its first Original: Whence he himself being no Bishop, could give no Episcopal or Sacerdotal Authority to others, against the Rules of the Catholick Church.

This I have there proved from very plain Evidences; to which I shall only add now, the Testimony of *Pacianus* Bishop of *Barcelona*, who wrote against the *Novatians*, An. 370. several Epistles, wherein he maintains, that *Novatian* was never truly Ordained a Bishop, but was only a Nominal Bishop, a False Bishop, a No-Bishop, <sup>b</sup> because he had no proper Ordainers, no lawful Consecration; his Consecration was against all ordinary Rules; he was not Ordained by the Bishops of the Province; but by the Letters and Instigation of some pretended Confessors; and that when the See was full, and another Bishop legally

---

<sup>b</sup> Pacian. Ep. 2. ad Sempronian. Bibl. Patr. T. 3. p. 56. cognosco Novatianum sine Consecratione Legitimâ Episcopum factum, ideoque nec factum. Ep. 3. p. 59. Novatianus tuus, ne falso quidem adhuc Episcopatu Sacerdos, &c. It. p. 60. Ille ex auctoritate Epistolarum, sedente jam Romæ Episcopo, adversum fas Sacerdotii singularis, alterius Episcopi sibi nomen assumit. Ep. 2. p. 55. Quem consecrante nullo, Linteata sedes accepit. Ep. 3. p. 57. He denies that he was Jure Ordinario consecratus ab Episcopis, &c.



legally ordained before him. So *Novatian* had only the Name and Title of a False Bishop, not the Right and Power of a True one. He also asserts, that the *Novatians* had no true <sup>c</sup> Priests among them, rightly Consecrated. Therefore, tho' they might give pretended Ordinations, and call themselves Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, yet they were but Nominally so, being destitute of that Original Power in their first Founder, which he ought to have had, to have handed down a Succession of Priests among them. For ought then that appears to the contrary, these *Novatians* were in the same Condition with those who never received any true Sacerdotal Commission at all, and therefore must be ranked in the same Class with Uncommissioned Laymen. All the Difference is, they pretended to a Formal Ordination, and a Divine Commission, and the Authority of Priests (which meer Laymen do not use to do in the Church); but the Church made no Account of these Pretences, but treated them as Laymen in a double Respect, both because they first wanted a true Ordination and Commission originally; and, secondly, because tho' they had had once a true Commission and Authority, yet they had forfeited their Title to all Sacerdotal Authority and Power, by becoming Hereticks, and falling under the Churches Censure.

I know indeed this Author pretends, *Pag. 198.* that the Council of *Nice* acknowledged the *Novatians* "to be true Priests and not Laymen, "Persons destitute of Commission; but still Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, with an indeluted, "unre-

---

<sup>c</sup> Id. Ep. 3. p. 58. *Vestrae Plebi unde Spiritum, quam non consignat unctus Sacerdos?*



“unrepealed Commission to baptize. And says, P. 202. “That they and other Hereticks and “Schismaticks had the Churches Lawful Authority and Commission to baptize.” Which would be very strange indeed, that the Church should first by her Discipline vacate the Commission of Hereticks, and take away their Authority from them; and say particularly of the *Novatians*, that they were no true Priests of God, nor had Sacerdotal Authority, nor yet any true Ordination or Commission from the beginning; and yet, after all, say likewise, as this Author represents it, that these very Hereticks were still true Bishops, Priests and Deacons, with the Churches Lawful Authority and Unrepealed Commission to baptize, and consequently perform all other Spiritual Offices of the Ministerial Function. This would be monstrous indeed, that the Church should so contradict herself upon the very same Article of Discipline in relation to the very same Persons. But the truth of the matter is, our Author understood not the Churches Discipline in this Point, and therefore he makes a woful Misrepresentation of it. The Council of *Nice* or any other Council never allowed the *Novatians* to be true Bishops, Presbyters or Deacons, during their Heresy or Schism; but looked upon them as false Priests, destitute of Sacerdotal Power, and the Churches lawful Authority and Commission to baptize: But if they were willing to return to the Unity of the Church, then they might enjoy those Honourable Stations by the Churches Authority and Commission, which they had only in Pretence, without any Legal Authority or Commission laid claim to before. This was not to say, that Hereticks and Schismaticks were true Priests of God, invested



vested with the Churches Authority and Commission, whilst they remained in Heresy or Schism, Degraded and Divested of all Sacerdotal Authority by the Churches Censures: For this were a manifest Contradiction in itself, and utterly inconsistent with the Proceedings and Discipline of all the ancient Councils: But the meaning is, that they who before were only Nominal Priests, should now by the Churches Favour have the Authority of Real Priests, and act by her Commission in the same Station that they had usurped before, in contradiction to all the Laws and Rules of the Catholick Church, which with one Voice declare Hereticks and Schismatics to be no true Priests of God, whilst they continue in that State, whatever this Author pretends to the contrary.

We need not now dispute what Names they were to be called by, whether Priests or Laymen: If they had lost the Churches Commission and Authority, they were as much unqualified, for that time, as to any Acts, Intents or Purposes of the Sacerdotal Power, as the meerest Layman, who never had any Authority or Commission from the Church. Our Author owns it was so by the Discipline of the *Cyprianick* Churches, and I have proved that it was so by the Discipline of all Churches. And, till our Author disproves this, the Charge will lie upon him, that he has grossly mistaken and misrepresented the Practice and Discipline of the ancient Church, by putting the Authority and Commission of true Priests of God into the Hands of Hereticks and Schismatics, which the ancient Councils unanimously agree to take from them.

I may now appeal to his own Conscience and the World, to Decide, which of us looks most like



like an Abettor of Hereticks and Schismatics, or pleads most for the Power of the Church, and the Authority of the Priesthood ; He who against the Sense of all the ancient Church, puts the Power of the Priesthood, and the Commis- sion and Authority of the Church into the hands of Hereticks and Schismatics, and makes them true Priests of God ; Or I, who, in Compli- ance with the Rules and Discipline of the an- cient Church, shew how all these things may be denied them, and all these Powers and Privi- leges taken from them ? His Assertions tend to the Detriment and Dishonour of the Churches Power, and the Debasement of her Authority, by saying (and that against Truth and Fact too) “ That all the ancient Churches, except the “ *Cyprianick*, allowed Hereticks and Schismatics “ to be true Priests of God, to be true Bishops, “ Priests and Deacons, even whilst they were de- “ clared Hereticks, and under the Churches “ Censures.,, Which is such a Reproach to the ancient Discipline, and such a Stretch upon the Truth of ancient History, that one would think a Man had never looked into a Volume of the ancient Councils, that could be guilty of so grand a Mistake, and make such a Dishonourable and Partial Representation of the Churches Disci- pline, when there is scarce a Council in all the *Tomes*, but what might have taught him other- wise. Therefore, as well for the Honour of the ancient Church, as to shew this Gentleman and his Friends their Error, I have shewed at large, from incontestable Evidences, (from the History of General and Provincial Councils, Authori- ties that cannot be turned off by the little Arti- fice of saying, they are only Private Authors that speak their own Private Sense) that the an- cient



cient Discipline was not so favourable to the Priesthood of Hereticks as this Author supposes. And now let the World judge, who has said most for the Honour of Sacerdotal Powers, or who is the greatest Favourer of Heretical Pretensions.

But this Author and Dr. *Brett* were both of them very sensible, that unless Hereticks were allowed to have Sacerdotal Authority and Powers, their Cause was infallibly lost. For then it will undeniably follow, that Men who were no authorized Priests, but Laymen, might administer the Outward Form of Baptism, so far Valid as not to need Repeating. For it cannot be denied that the Baptisms given by these ancient Hereticks, who were no Authorized Priests by the Discipline of the ancient Church, but Unauthorized Laymen, were notwithstanding, received by the Church without Rebaptization. The consequence of which is very plain, that then the ancient Church, all except the *Cyprianists*, did receive the Baptisms of those whom she esteemed to be no Priests: And it matters not what Names they were called by, whether *Unauthorized Priests* or *Unauthorized Laymen*; for it is not Names we are disputing about, but the Authority and Powers of the Men, who took upon them to administer the outward Form of Baptism. If they had not the Churches Authority and Power, they were not the Churches Priests; and if they were not the Churches Priests, they were no Priests of God: If the Church discarded them from all Ministerial Authority and Power, from all Sacerdotal Office and Function (as she certainly did) then they might call themselves Priests, and pretend to the Rights, and Authority, and Commission of

B b

Priests



Priests still, but the Church made no other account of them but as of Nominal or False Priests, as of Uncommissioned Priests, divested of all Authority and Commission, and reduced to the state of Laymen.

If these things stand good (as I am confident they will with all Impartial and Unprejudiced Men, by the strength of the Evidences in the foregoing Discourse) then there is an end of the Dispute between me and this Gentleman, about the Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church, relating to the Administration of the Outward Form of Baptism, by Unauthorized and Uncommissioned Persons. For if Hereticks, who lose their Commission which they once had, be as much Unauthorized thenceforward, as any Laymen who never had a Commission, their Case, as to Actual Sacerdotal Authority and Power, is then the same: And if their Baptisms were received by the ancient Church only by Imposition of Hands or Confirmation; that is, by compleating what was Deficient for want of Authority, not Repeating what was actually done, tho' without Authority; then it must be owned, that the Baptisms given by Persons who had no actual Authority or Commission (call them what you please, *Uncommissioned Priests* or *Uncommissioned Laymen*) was received by the ancient Catholick Church without Rebaptization. Which is the thing I have undertaken to shew, against Dr. *Brett* and this Author; and I hope I have done it with as good Proofs as the Nature of an Historical Subject is capable of, to the evidence of a Demonstration. And if either of them can bring better Proofs for their Assertions than I have done for mine, they shall not fail to have my Assent upon Rational Conviction.

Only



Only I desire now they would observe their own Rules, and stick to the Conditions they impose upon me, that is, give us the Sense of the Church from her Publick Acts, from her General and Provincial Councils, as I now have done, and not from any dark and ambiguous Expressions of Private Writers.

I also desire they would not dispute any more about Words, nor charge me with Contradictions where there are none. To avoid which beforehand, I think fit to obviate two Exceptions which I know they will be inclin'd to make, as if I had contradicted myself upon this Subject.

The first is, That in the former part of my *Scholastical History* I have said, That the Usurped Baptism of Laymen was not decreed to be valid by the Determination of any General Council: And now I pretend to prove, That the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismatics is but the Baptism of Laymen, by the Determination of all the General Councils; which carries the face and appearance of a Contradiction. But this will easily be cleared among Wise and Ingenuous Men, by distinguishing the several Acceptations of the Word *Laymen*; which may be taken either *first*, for Catholick Laymen, who never had any pretence to Sacerdotal Authority or Commission in the Church; or, *secondly*, for Heretical Laymen, who pretended to have a Sacerdotal Commission, when they really had none; such as I have shewed the *Novatians* to be in the ancient Church: or, *thirdly*, for such Laymen as once had a true Sacerdotal Commission, but were afterward deprived of their Commission, by the same Power of the Church which first gave it, and so were reduced to the state and condition of Laymen again. Such Laymen were all the



ancient Hereticks and Schismaticks that had received a Legal Ordination in the Church, but afterward were deprived of their Authority and Commission for their Crimes, their Obstinacy and Rebellion, by the Churches Censures. Such Laymen, our Author confesses, all Hereticks and Schismaticks were made by the Discipline of the *Cyprianick* Churches; and such Laymen, I say, they were made by the Discipline of the Church Universal in all Ages. Now when I said before, that the Usurped Baptism of Laymen was not decreed to be Valid by the Determination of any General Council, I spake of Laymen in the first Sense, in the vulgar and common acceptation, as denoting Laymen in the Church, who lay no Claim to Sacerdotal Powers peculiar to the Clergy of the Church. And I do not yet remember any General Council that has directly determined any thing for or against the validity of Baptism administered by such Laymen. But in the second Sense I think the Council of *Nice* has determined the validity of Laymens Baptism, because she received the Baptism of the *Novatian* Hereticks, who pretended to have a true Sacerdotal Commission, when they really had none. And in the third Sense I have shewed, that several General Councils admitted of the Baptism of Laymen, because they admitted of the Baptism of Hereticks, whom they themselves deprived of all Sacerdotal Authority and Commission, and reduced to the Quality of Laymen. So that there is no contradiction in all this, when Matters are rightly adjusted and distinguished.

The other Exception I would obviate against beforehand, is in relation to what I have said about Heretical Priests, in determining whether they



they be Priests or Laymen. In the First Part of the *Scholastical History* I asserted, That Heretical Priests were, in some sense, allowed to be Priests, and their Ordination to be valid, even after Degradation. The meaning of which I explained to be this, That if they were once truly Ordained, the Church did not intend by her Censures so far to cancel or annul their Ordination, as to make it necessary, when she recalled them to their Office again, to give them a new Ordination. And thus far I still allow the Character of a Priest, degraded for Heresy by the Censures of the Church, to be Indelible, that is, that the Church, upon his Repentance, needs not give him a new Ordination. But I did not intend hereby to say, that Heretical Priests could not be legally deprived of the Authority, and Power, and Commission of Priests; or, that the Church never so deprived them; or, That when they were actually so deprived of all Authority and Commission, they had still the Authority of God and the Church, and were in actual Commission as Lawful Priests to Baptize, or perform any other Sacerdotal Acts, notwithstanding their Deprivation. And therefore when I assert in this Book, that Hereticks were deprived of all Authority and Commission actually by the Church, and during their Heresy denied all Sacerdotal Powers, as much as any other Laymen; I take this to be no Contradiction to what I said before, but fairly consistent with it, in the Understanding of any Intelligent and Unprejudiced Reader. And therefore I desire our Author not to multiply Disputes about hard Terms, with a Design to involve and cloud my Discourse under pretence of Contradictions, but to consider fairly what I have now offered from



the ancient Discipline of the Church, to prove that Hereticks may be deprived of all Sacerdotal Authority, Commission and Power; and that they were actually so deprived by the Rules of all the ancient Councils, which yet allowed the Validity of their Baptisms so far, as not to repeat them by Rebaptization. If this Author can shew, either, 1<sup>st</sup>, That the Baptisms of Hereticks were rejected universally, by the unanimous Vote of all the ancient Councils; or, 2<sup>dly</sup>, That those Hereticks whose Baptisms were received, were true Priests of God, in actual Commission and Authority when they baptized, and not reduced to the condition of Laymen by the Censures of the Church; then I will own he has the truth of ancient History on his Side: But if he can fairly make out neither of these things, then my Assertions will stand good, 1. That the ancient Church did receive the Baptism of such Hereticks as administered it in due Form. 2. That those Hereticks were not reputed to be true Priests of God, but destitute of Sacerdotal Authority and Commission when they administered such Baptisms: And that therefore, 3<sup>dly</sup>, the Baptisms of Persons destitute of Sacerdotal Authority and Commission, when they administered them, were received by the Catholick Church without Rebaptization. These are the things I assert and maintain, and this Author may now try his Skill in Ecclesiastical History to prove them to be otherwise.

Our Author owns, That this was the Principle and Discipline of all the *Cyprianick* Churches, that Hereticks and Schismatics were deprived of their Authority and Commission, and thenceforward not to be reputed Priests, but Laymen: They had no regard to the modern Notion of the



the pretended Indelible Character of Priests, but thought, that if Priests did things unworthy of their Character, their Sacerdotal Authority and Commission might then legally, by the Power of the Church, be taken from them: And thence they concluded, that the Baptisms of Hereticks and Schismatics were null and void, because they were given by Persons who had lost their Sacerdotal Authority and Commission. Now, I say, the Catholick Church entirely agreed with the *Cyprianists* in their Principle and Discipline, that Hereticks were actually deprived of all Sacerdotal Authority and Commission by the authentick Power of the Church and her Legal Censures: But she differed from them in the Inference or Conclusion which they deduced from it: For whereas the *Cyprianists* said, the Baptism of Hereticks is null and void, because Hereticks are deprived of that Sacerdotal Authority and Commission which perhaps they once might have from the Church, and were now not Priests but Laymen; the Catholick Church concluded otherwise, That tho' Hereticks were truly deprived of Sacerdotal Authority and Commission by the Censures and Authority of the Church, yet the Baptisms given by them in that state were not wholly null and void, if given in due Form, nor so far Invalid as to need the Outward Form to be repeated by Rebaptization. The difference was not in their Principle, it is plain then, nor in their Discipline about Heretical Priests, but in the different Conclusions they drew from it: The one said the Baptisms of Heretical Priests are Null, the other said, they were not Null, whilst they both agreed in this, that Hereticks were not true Priests of God, but deprived of all Sacer-



dotal Authority and Commission by the Discipline and Authority of the Church.

It is plain now to any ordinary Capacity, that if Matters stood thus in the Catholick Church, she must needs receive the Baptisms of Persons destitute of Sacerdotal Authority and Commission; for they could not have a Divine Commission, when GOD and his Church agreed to take it from them: And if they had no Commission, they were not true Priests, however they might sometimes equivocally bear the Name and Title; which are not the things we are disputing about, but the Qualifications and Authority of the Persons. For let them be called Priests or Laymen, they were certainly Men destitute of a Commission, when all Sacerdotal Authority was taken from them; and if the Church received the Baptisms of such Men, it is evident she received the Baptisms of Unauthorized and Uncommissioned Persons; who were destitute of a Commission, not because they were originally without it as other Laymen (tho' some Hereticks might be so) but because they were deprived of it by the just Powers and Discipline of the Church. This I have fully proved against Dr. *Brett*, and I reckon it a sufficient Answer to any thing this Author has pretended to offer farther concerning the Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church, who makes no new Discoveries, but only represents things with a little more Artifice, and that not always the most laudable, as will appear in the sequel of this Discourse.



## C H A P. II.

*Containing Remarks on our Author's  
Preface.*

**H**AVING shewed our Author's Grand Mistake, in supposing all the ancient Hereticks to be true Priests in actual Commission, against all the Discipline of the ancient Church, I now proceed to make such Remarks on the remaining part of his Preface and Book, as shall seem necessary to set Matters in a just Light to every candid and unprejudiced Reader : *Page 3.* of his Preface he is offended that I charge him with a great Error in confounding the Terms of Unauthorized Baptism and Invalid Baptism together. And for any thing he has said to clear himself, I still charge him with the same Error, in going against the Sense of the ancient Church, who distinguished between Unauthorized Baptisms and Invalid Baptisms, and reckoned many Baptisms to be Unauthorized, which she did not esteem Invalid ; particularly the Baptisms of Hereticks, who had no actual Commission, as true authorized Priests, when she had taken away their Commission from them ; those Baptisms she esteemed Unauthorized, but not Invalid, so as to need repeating by Rebaptization. And our Author must first shew, that Hereticks were true Authorized Priests by the Discipline of

## §. I.

*That Unauthorized Baptisms, and Invalid Baptisms are not of the same Import in the Sense of the ancient Church.*



of the ancient Church, and in actual Commission at the time they pretended to baptize, before he will clear himself of the Error I charge upon him. For it is not sufficient to say, they once had a true Commission, unless he also shew, that they had never lost their Commission, by being deprived of it by the Censures of the Church. For if they had lost their Commission at the time they pretended to baptize, they were as much Unauthorized as those who never had any Commission at all. And yet the Church received the Unauthorized Baptisms of these Unauthorized Men, and did not pronounce them wholly null and void, but received the Persons so baptized by them, without Rebaptization. Which shews, That Unauthorized Baptism and Invalid Baptism were not Terms of the same Import in the Sense of the ancient Church, however our Author is pleased to make them so, which is the thing I charge upon him.

## §. 2.

*This Author's Reasons for the validity of Heretical Baptism, very different from those of the Primitive Church.*

In the next place, Page 6. he complains that the rest of the Churches in the World  
 “ would not concur with Cy-  
 “ prian, nor agree with him,  
 “ to make frustrate and void,  
 “ during their Heresy and  
 “ Schism, the Commissions once received by  
 “ their Heretical and Schismatical Subjects.”  
 This Grand Charge against the Universal Church I have already shewed to be a Grand Mistake : For all the Churches in the World did thus far concur with Cyprian, as to make frustrate and void the Commissions of Hereticks and Schismatics, during their Heresy and Schism :



Schism: Only they did not conclude with him, that therefore the Baptisms of Hereticks are absolutely Invalid, and to be repeated again, as being given by Persons out of Commission; which was a wrong Inference of *Cyprian's*, in which the Catholick Church never would concur with him. But our Author is very confident, that the Reason why the Churches differing from *Cyprian*, did not make void the Baptisms given by Hereticks, was only because those Churches had no Laws to take away the Sacerdotal Commission of Hereticks from them. Which is not only said without Proof, but against the glaring Evidence of so many Laws of General and Provincial Councils, which I have now produced, to shew, that the Church abounded with such Laws, which were actually put in execution upon Hereticks, upon every proper Occasion, vacating their Commissions, and taking away all Sacerdotal Authority from them. And I am amazed to think, how any Man could converse with ancient Councils, and not observe this, which almost occurs in every Page of them.

## §. 3.

*This Author's Notion about the Invalidity of Heretical Baptism, unbaptizes the whole Church of England.*

But for all this our Author will still have it, that the Validity of Heretical Baptism depended upon Hereticks having a true Commission, not vacated or taken away during their Heresy or Schism. For these are his words, *Pag. 7.* "Those Churches held such Baptisms to be valid in themselves, as to their Ministration, and so do I too, because there was no want of Commission." Now, if I rightly understand him, this is as much



much as to say, That if Hereticks have not a Commission, their Baptism is Invalid. I cannot see but that by our Principles it must be so. And therefore unless he can shew, that the ancient Hereticks and Schismatics had a Lawful and Unvacated Commission, during their Heresy or Schism, he must needs conclude their Baptism was Invalid. And then I will venture to say again, That such Notions concerning the Invalidity of Heretical and Schismatical Baptism, do Unchurch and Unbaptize the whole Church of *England*, however angry our Author is for bringing so heavy a Charge against him. He says, I should have named his black Notions in his own words. And I did so in my Remarks upon him, *Pag. 153, &c.* But if he was pleased to overlook it, that was his Fault, and not mine.

Now the Charge was this : That he had then declared himself freely for the *Cyprianick* Notion of the Invalidity of Heretical and Schismatical Baptism ; and withal declared, that the Baptisms of the Church of *Rome* were the Baptisms of a Church that was over-run with abundance of Damnable Doctrines and Practices, and had but little of solid or substantial Religion to be found in her Communion. Upon which I told him plainly, That if the Baptisms of Hereticks and Schismatics were Invalid, and the Church of *Rome* were an Heretical and Schismatical Church ; and the Church of *England* had her Baptisms originally from that Church, and no other ; that then the consequence must be, that all the Baptisms of the Church of *England* were Invalid, and that there was no true Baptism administered by her Priests, any more than by any others. Now to free himself from this Charge, he



he thinks fit to say, "He believes the Baptism  
" of Hereticks to be valid in such Churches, as  
" did not by their Discipline vacate or take a-  
" way the Commission of Hereticks from them."  
But then I tell him his Supposition is utterly  
false; there were anciently no such Churches,  
as left Hereticks and Schismaticks in possession  
of their Authority and Commission; and I have  
proved my Assertion by as undeniable Evidences  
as can be given: And therefore, till he disproves  
them, and proves his own Supposition by stronger  
Evidences, the Charge I bring against him,  
must rest upon him; and, whether he will re-  
pent of and retract his Unchurching Principles  
or not, I see yet no reason to take off the just  
Reproach which is laid upon him. I can be as  
civil to his Person as he desires, but if he ad-  
vances such false Assertions and Positions, as  
reproach the Universal Church and the Church  
of *England* together, he must excuse me, if I  
think myself in common Justice bound to shew  
him his Mistakes, and with some Reflexion on  
his Principles do Justice to our common Mo-  
ther.

His next Exceptions are  
Pag. 8 and 9, against the Pro-  
posal I humbly offered to our  
Superiors, legally assembled in  
Convocation, concerning a  
peculiar Form of Confirmati-  
on, for such as were baptized

§. 4.

*The Exceptions of  
our Author against  
the new Form of Con-  
firmation, which was  
proposed to the Con-  
vocation, considered.*

by Hereticks and Schismaticks. He hopes our  
Superiors will distinguish between such Here-  
ticks as received an Episcopal Commission, and  
those that never had one. I think neither he  
nor I need direct our Superiors what is fit and  
proper



proper to be done in this Case. But I will make bold to tell him again, That if Hereticks lose their Commission which they once had; if their Commission be vacated by the Censures of the Church, and taken from them by the same Authority that gave it; then their Sacerdotal Authority and Powers are not so vastly different from those who never had a Commission, as he imagines. For he himself owns, That a Commission once received, and afterwards vacated, was reduced to an equality with a No Commission ever received at all, by the Discipline of the *Cyprianick* Churches. And I have made it appear, That this was the Case of the ancient Hereticks, by the Discipline of all Churches. So that whatever Forms of Confirmation were made for Persons baptized by those Hereticks, must needs be for Persons baptized by such Men as had no Actual Commission, but Antiquated, Vacated, and taken from them. And where then is the mighty difference between such a vacated Commission, and no Commission at all? But our Author cannot yet believe, that the ancient Hereticks had their Commissions so vacated and taken from them by any other beside the *Cyprianick* Churches. He had best therefore enquire a little farther into this Matter, and give himself and the World a little more rational Satisfaction, before he is too Dogmatical and Peremptory in directing his Superiors, and fixing Distinctions to be Rules to their Proceedings.

But he has a pleasant Exception behind, against the Form of Confirmation which I subjoined as an Exemplar. He says, "It was only the Product of the Ninth Century, and wants the noble Character of what is Catholick, that is,



“ is, Antiquity, Universality, and Consent. ”  
 I am a little at a loss here to know what this Gentleman would have, especially when he adds,  
 “ That I might with as much reason have given  
 “ an Instance of Image-Worship and Invocation  
 “ of Saints from the Second Council of *Nice*. ”  
 But why so much Anger against an Innocent Form of Prayer? Or why, to make it answer the End for which I proposed it, must it needs have Antiquity, Universality, and Consent? Have we now any Apostolical Liturgies? Or any particular Forms of Prayer, except the Lord's Prayer and some few others in Scripture, which may pretend to this noble Character and a general Reception over all the Church in all Ages? A Man may as reasonably object against some of our Common-Prayers, that they are taken out of the Mass-Book, as this Author does against this Form, because it is only fetched from the Ninth Century, when every one knows, Prayers of the same Sense and Kind, tho' not of the same Length and Words, may be found among the first Orders that were made by General Councils for the Reception of those that were baptized by Hereticks, into the Communion of the Church. But if our Author is not more sparing in such Objections as these, I shall be obliged to be a little more sparing in my Answers.

Page 11. We have something more Candid and Ingenuous from him. He confesses he made an undesigned Slip, when he mistook a Minor Proposition for a Major, and therefore brought *Lucifer* upon the Stage as a Witness for the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, and St. *Jerom*

S. 5.

Our Author confesses his Mistake in producing *Lucifer* as a Witness against Lay-Baptism.

as



as asserting the same by the Authority of the *Nicene* Council: He civilly thanks me for helping him to correct these Mistakes; and I hope I shall have his Thanks again for setting him right once more about the Priesthood and Commission of Hereticks and Schismaticks, when I shew him that it was vacated and taken from them, during their Heresy and Schism, by the universal Consent and Vote of the whole Catholick Church. After which I shall have no longer occasion to dispute with him, about Unauthorized or Uncommissioned Baptism, from the History of the Church; since all the World will own, that a Vacated Commission and a No-Commission are pretty near a Parallel; and if the Church received the Baptisms of those as Valid, whose Commission she had vacated, she might as well receive the Baptisms of those who never had any Commission at all, because they were both actually and equally without Commission when they pretended to Baptize; the one, as never having had any Commission, the other as having lost their Commission by the Churches Censures.

§. 6.  
*How our Author  
confounds Valid Bap-  
tism and Saving Bap-  
tism together.*

But our Author alters his Stile in the same Page, and, instead of Thanks, charges me with Captiousness and Caviling, only because I desired to know, in what Writing of the *Stephanians* he found this maintained, That they who had received Baptism from Hereticks or Schismaticks, were in a State of Salvation? He says, "Any one who has looked into *Cyprian's* Works, must know, that *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome*, did hold, that such baptized Persons were in a State of Salvation, for they esteemed them to have been



“ been Validly baptized ; and sure they who held  
“ Men to have been validly baptized, esteemed  
“ them to have been in a state of Salvation, other-  
“ wise what signified the validity of their Baptism?  
To which I answer, without Captiousness or Ca-  
villing, that it signified thus much, That they  
were not to be Rebaptized when they came over  
to the Catholick Church ; but it did not signify,  
That they were in a state of Salvation while  
they continued in Heresy or Schism : For these  
things are very different from one another :  
*St. Austin*, and all the Catholick Church, defen-  
ded the validity of Heretical Baptism against the  
*Donatists*, but they did not tell them or any o-  
ther Hereticks, that therefore they were in a  
state of Salvation while they were Hereticks,  
because they had a valid Baptism ; for then it  
had been in vain to exhort them to come over  
to the Catholick Church in order to be saved.  
So that unless Pope *Stephen* had some very pe-  
culiar Notion of the Salvability of Hereticks,  
different from the rest of the Church, he could  
not be of the Opinion our Author fathers upon  
him : For there is no Consequence in our Au-  
thor's Proof. *Stephen* believed the Baptism of  
Hereticks to be valid, *ergo*, he believed Here-  
ticks to be in a state of Salvation : For Men  
may have valid Baptism, and yet be in a state  
of Damnation, as Hereticks out of the Church,  
and such wicked Men as *Simon Magus* in the  
Church : Which is so plain, that I will not  
stand longer to dispute it with our Author, but  
leave it to the Reader to judge who is the most  
cavilling Person, I who distinguish Valid Baptism  
from Saving Baptism, with all the Ancients ; or  
he who, to make good his Charge against Pope  
*Stephen*, thus admirably confounds different things  
together.



§. 7.

*That Heretical Baptism is properly Anti-Episcopal by our Author's own Concessions.*

I here pass over two or three things, as not worth disputing any longer about them; as whether *Athanasius* was represented by our Author to be of *Cyprian's* Opinion; and what number of Bishops there was in the Council of *Arles*, 33 or 200; and pass on to a more material Question, Whether the Baptism of Heretical Bishops was not esteemed the Baptism of False Bishops, or No-Bishops, and all their Ministrations reckoned Anti-episcopal? Our Author says, *Pag. 15.* "I must needs know  
" that the *Novatians*, and other Hereticks and  
" Schismatics began their Heresies and Schisms  
" in Episcopacy." But I am so far from knowing this, that I hope to make our Author know the contrary: For I have made it more than probable in the foregoing Discourse, *Chap. II.* that *Novatian* himself, the first Founder of the *Novatians*, was never truly ordained a Bishop, but his Ordination was declared null and void by the Catholick Church, *ab origine*; because, tho' he had three Bishops to give him a pretended Ordination, yet it was done in such a manner, against so many standing Rules of the Catholick Church, that the Church declared it a void Ordination from the very first, and he was never admitted into the College of Bishops, but esteemed a False Bishop, a Counterfeit Bishop, a No-Bishop from the beginning. By our Author's own Rules then he could be no true Bishop, because the Catholick Church declared him to be a False One. Our Author says farther, "That those first Heretical and Schismatical Bishops so ordained, had not their Orders nulled and voided by those Churches that  
" allowed



“allowed their Baptisms.” But I have evidently proved the contrary, to a Demonstration, That those Heretical and Schismatical Bishops had their Commissions repealed and vacated, not only by the *Cyprianick* Churches, which annulled their Baptisms, but by the *Roman* Churches, and the whole Catholick Church, and the Bishops of the whole World, who allowed their Baptisms to be valid, so far as not to need Repeating. They took away their Commissions and Authority from them, and declared them to be False Bishops, Counterfeit Bishops, and No-Bishops; and tho’ they called themselves Bishops, yet they were really no Bishops in the Eye of the Church, because she had taken away their Commissions, and reduced them by her own Authority to the state of Laymen. Our Author owns, the Church had such a Power to vacate their Commissions, and that the *Cyprianick* Churches did actually exercise this Power upon them: In which Case he allows, that Heretical Bishops were Un-bishoped, by being deprived of their Commissions by the Discipline of those Churches, and reduced plainly to a state of Laymen. Now I have proved to him farther, that this same Power was claimed and actually exercised by all the Churches in the World against Heretical Bishops; that they did deprive them of their Commissions, divest them of their Authority, take away all Episcopal and Sacerdotal Power from them, and then declare them henceforward to be no Bishops nor Priests, but in the state of Laymen. So that upon this Supposition, that their Commissions were vacated and taken from them, it follows upon our Author’s own Principles and Concessions, that these Heretical Bishops were



no longer true Authorized and Commissioned Bishops or Priests of GOD, but Uncommissioned Laymen ; being deprived, by the Authority of the Catholick Church, of that Commission which they once were posselt of.

And now let our Author or any other Man judge, whether the Baptisms of these Hereticks and Schismaticks were not, upon this Supposition, the Baptisms of No-Priests, and Anti-Episcopal Baptisms, and the Baptisms of Unauthorized and Uncommissioned Laymen. I do not say Laymen that never had a Commission, (that our Author may not quibble) but Men that were actually deprived of their Commission by the Bishops of the Church, and set themselves up against Bishops after they were reduced to the State of Laymen. If such Baptisms were not Anti-Episcopal, I know not what Anti-Episcopal means ; or what are Uncommissioned Baptisms, if the Baptisms of these Men were not Uncommissioned, when their Commission was taken from them. Our Author now will not pretend to take Sanctuary, as some of his Friends do, in that bold Assertion against the Authority of the Church, That a Priest is a true Priest, still in Authority, let the Church do what she will to take his Commission from him, and bring him back to the State of a Layman. For our Author owns, the Church both has and ought to have such a Power ; and that the *Cyprianick* Churches did actually exercise this Power upon Hereticks by their Discipline, Vacating the Commissions of Heretical Bishops and Priests, and leaving them destitute of all Sacerdotal Authority in the Condition of Laymen : So that the only Question remaining between this Author and me, is, Whether the rest of the Churches of the



the World did actually exercise the same Power against Heretical Bishops and Priests? For if they did, they plainly made them Laymen: And then if any of those Laymen set up against their Bishops, or the College of Bishops, pretending to baptize without regaining a Commission from them, their Baptisms in that Case must needs be Anti-Episcopal Baptisms, the Baptisms of False Priests, or No-Priests, as having no Commission, but a Vacated and Repealed one, and the Baptisms of Unauthorized and Uncommissioned Laymen. I would speak as plainly as I can upon this Head, because the whole of our Dispute depends upon this single Point: And, if our Author will fairly try it out, we will lay aside all other Debates, and stick to this, and let Truth prevail on that side which appears to have the clearest Evidences and strongest Reasons. 'Tis a Question of Fact and History, that may easily be decided by the Publick Records of the Church, the Acts of her General and Provincial Councils in all Ages, which contain her Proceedings against Hereticks, whereby it may easily be discovered whether she vacated the Commission of Hereticks and took their Sacerdotal Authority from them or not. If she did not Vacate their Commission, then I will yield the Cause to this Author: But if I have made it appear, that she did vacate their Commission, and deprive them of all Sacerdotal Authority, then I expect he will as civilly give up the Cause to me, That the ancient Hereticks were not true Bishops and Priests in Lawful Commission, but Anti-Episcopal Usurpers, acting without, and against the Commission of the true Bishops of the Church; and that their Baptisms consequently were not the Baptisms of true Commissioned Priests,



Priests, but the Baptisms of Anti-Episcopal, Un-commissioned, Unauthorized Laymen, made such by the Churches Censures. And I desire no more to be allowed me, to prove, that the ancient Catholick Church received as Valid, without Rebaptizing, such Baptisms as were given in due Form, by Men who at the time of Baptizing had lost their Commission, and were not then true Priests of God in actual Commis-sion, but at that Instant Unauthorized and Un-commissioned Laymen.

§. 8.

*That our Author's Charge upon his Ad-versaries, of Dissol-ving the Necessity of the Christian Priest-hood, equally reflects upon the Principles and Practice of the whole Catholick Church in all Ages.*

I shall but make one Obser-  
vation more upon our Au-  
thor's long Preface, and that  
is the Sting in the close of it.  
“ To conclude my long Pre-  
“ face, says he, I leave this  
“ with our Reverend Histo-  
“ rian, as he is a Clergyman,  
“ and do affirm, that it is a  
“ Proposition very easy to be  
“ proved against any Man whatsoever, That if  
“ Baptism performed by Persons who were ne-  
“ ver really and truly Commissioned by Bishops  
“ to baptize, and who act herein rebelliously a-  
“ gainst, and in opposition to the Divine Right  
“ of Episcopacy, be Good and Valid Baptism;  
“ then Authoritative Preaching, Administring  
“ the other Sacrament, the Power of Excom-  
“ municating, of Binding and Loosing, of Re-  
“ taining and absolving Mens Sins, and all the  
“ Spiritual Functions of the Clergy, are also  
“ Good and Valid, when attempted by Unau-  
“ thorized, Never-commissioned Lay-Persons:  
“ The Consequence of which, is the utter Dis-  
“ solution and taking away the Necessity of the  
“ Christian



“ Christian Priesthood, therefore of CHRIST’s  
“ Authority here on Earth, and so of all Reveal-  
“ ed Religion too; which is a dreadful Consi-  
“ deration; and much more so, if any who ought  
“ to be the Guardians of these Sacred Things,  
“ should endeavour by their Writings and Preach-  
“ ing, to establish the dangerous Premises, from  
“ whence such Prophane Consequences do na-  
“ turally flow.”

Our Author had done much better to have proved this solidly, than to have barely said it, and threatened what he could do: For no one will believe him, but only those who take every thing upon his Word meerly because he says it. Let the Consideration be as dreadful as it will, I not only say, but have proved to our Author, that it neither affects me, nor the Bishops of the present Church ( who are most of them involved in the same Accusation) any more than it does the whole Catholick Church, which allowed the Validity of Heretical Baptism, at the same time that she deprived Hereticks of their Sacerdotal Commission, and esteemed them really and truly no more Priests, during their Heresy, (tho’ they once had a Commission) than the most Unauthorized Layman, who never had any Commission at all. And therefore, with a little Variation of necessary Terms, I shall draw up his Accusation against the Primitive Church, as near as may be, in his own Words: If Baptism performed by Persons, who are really and truly Deprived of their Commission to baptize by the Bishops of the Catholick Church, and who act after such Deprivation, rebelliously against, and in opposition to the Divine Right of Episcopacy, be Good and Valid Baptism, as the ancient Church asserted, then Authoritative

C c 4

Preach-



Preaching, Adminiftring the other Sacrament, the Power of Excommunicating, of Binding and Loofing, of Retaining and Absolving Mens Sins, and all the Spiritual Functions of the Clergy, are alfo Good and Valid, when attempted by Unauthorized Priests, whom the Church makes Laymen by depriving them of their Commiffion : The Confequence of which is, the utter Diffolution, and taking away of the Necessity of the Christian Priesthood, therefore of CHRIST's Authority here on Earth, and fo of all Reveal'd Religion too. Now if this Rant of an Argument would only be reckoned an insignificant Slander in any one that fhould level it againft the known Practice of the Primitive Church, in allowing the Baptifm of Hereticks to be Valid, when they were deprived of their Commiffion by the fame Power that firft gave it : I leave every one to judge what Name the fame Accufation deferves, when brought againft others, who are only relating and defending the Practice of the Ancient and Prefent Church againft the Pretences of Modern Innovators. Our Author will not pretend, there is any great Difference between a Vacated Commiffion once received, and a No-Commiffion never received at all : For as to Actual Authority, it is equally wanting in both : But he will ftill fay, the Primitive Church never vacated the Commiffion of thofe Hereticks whose Baptifm ſhe received as Valid; which, when he has faid it over a Thouſand times, will be no nearer Truth, but a grand Miſtake of his own, or ſome others, who abuſed his Credulity in informing him ſo ; and the more he repeats it, the more he will only abuſe himſelf and the World in Ecchoing forth their wrong Information.



I could say a great deal more, to shew the Weakness and Absurdity of this his Insinuation, but what I have already said is sufficient, with all Wise and Good Men, to vindicate the Guardians of Sacred Things from so vile an Aspersion; which reflects so much Dishonour on his Lawful Superiors, and so much Reproach on the ancient Catholick Church, with whom I take it to be an Honour to be Reproached by this Author, only for advancing the same Principles as the Catholick Church did, which he falsely charges with the consequence of dissolving all Revealed Religion, and the necessity of the Christian Priesthood; as if there were no necessity of Lawful Priests, because there may be some Usurpers; some Hereticks that have lost their Commission, and some that never had a Commission; whose Baptisms can confer no Graces of the Spirit, for which there is a necessity of Lawful Priests, but may give the outward Form in such a manner, as the Church thinks fit not to repeat by Rebaptization. Let him declaim as long and as loud against this as he pleases, and call it a Dissolving of the Necessity of the Christian Priesthood: It is only what I expected at his hands, who insults the Fathers of his Church with Contempt and Scorn, and under the Professions of Respect to Priests, treats all those rudely who are not his Followers and Admirers. All I shall say farther at present, upon this Head, to this Accuser of the Brethren, is only, *The Lord rebuke thee.*



## C H A P. III.

*Remarks on our Author's first and second Chapters.*

§. I.

*That the allowing the Baptisms of Usurpers to be valid, is not abetting or encouraging their Usurpations.*

HAVING thus far copiously considered our Author's Preface, I shall be more sparing upon his Book, because the main Controversy about Uncommissioned Baptism is already determined. Our Author's first Chapter is spent in a sharp Invective against the Usurpers of Sacerdotal Powers, and the Abettors and Encouragers of those Usurpations. In which I know no one that has engaged in the present Controversy, to be really concerned, tho' he would gladly insinuate and fasten the Charge upon them. He begins his Book by telling his Readers, "That the occasion of it is a most Novel and Unchristian Usurpation, attempted at the Reformation, and since that time to this Day, by Men who never received any Divine Commission; and who yet, in Opposition to, and Rebellion against their Spiritual Sovereigns, refusing to receive any such Commission from them, endeavour to advance themselves into the High-Priest's and Priest's Office, and to minister in such Holy things as God has appropriated to that Sacred Commission, which he gives to Men for that purpose. And this they do, not upon the Pretence of Necessity, arising,



“ arising, as some suppose, from the want of  
“ such as are Commissioned, but in an obstinate  
“ perverse resistance against CHRIST’S Spiritual  
“ Vicegerents, undervaluing and trampling up-  
“ on that Authority wherewith he has invested  
“ them. ”

Now, whatever there may be in this Accusation, it affects most his own Friends, I mean those who hold the same Opinions with our Author about Rebaptizing, that is, the Followers of *Cartwright* in *England*, and the *Calvinists* beyond Sea: For we of the Church of *England* are not concerned in any such pretended Usurpation. Yes, our Author says, “ we adhere  
“ to, and encourage them in their Usurpations,  
“ we concur with and abett them, because we  
“ affirm there is some validity in such pretended  
“ Ministrations. ” But if this were to be called abetting or encouraging Mens Usurpations, I could much more plausibly prove our Author guilty of abetting and encouraging Hereticks and Schismatics: For he maintains, That the Baptism of the ancient Hereticks and Schismatics was not only good and valid, but ministered with as good Authority and Divine Commission, as that of the Catholick Priests: which Assertion puts those Usurpers upon an equal Foot and Level with the true Priests of GOD, and the Authorized Baptizers of the Church, when yet I have evidently proved, that the ancient Hereticks were all of them destitute of Commission, and Anti-episcopal Usurpers. Again, if there be any Force in his Accusation, then, 1<sup>st</sup>, it holds equally against all the Church of *England*, and her whole College of Bishops ever since the Reformation, who have constantly admitted such as were baptized by these Usurpers,



furpers, without giving them a new Baptism. So that if allowing the bare validity of their Baptism be an abetting and encouraging of Usurpers, the whole Church of *England* has been involved in this Crime from the beginning of the Reformation. 2. His Accusation holds equally against the Primitive Church, for allowing the Validity of the Baptisms of the *Novatians*, who were not only deprived of their Commission as Hereticks, but originally destitute of Episcopal Commission, having, as I have proved, never received a true Episcopal Ordination. 3. It involves the whole Primitive Church in the same Crime of abetting or encouraging Usurpers, because she allowed the Validity of the Baptisms of those Hereticks, whom she deprived of their Commission by her own Authority, and esteemed them no Priests after that, but meer Usurpers. For these Men, only changing the Terms, *Having never received a Divine Commission*, into, *Being deprived of their Divine Commission*, were as liable to the Character which our Author gives of Unchristian Usurpers, as those against whom he levels it: “ For they were deprived of their Divine Com-  
“ mission, and yet in Opposition to, and Rebel-  
“ lion against their Spiritual Sovereigns; they  
“ endeavoured to advance themselves into the  
“ High-Priests and Priests Office, and to mini-  
“ ster in such Holy Things as God had appro-  
“ priated to that Sacred Commission, which he  
“ gives to Men for that purpose; and this they  
“ did, not upon the Pretence of Necessity, aris-  
“ ing from the want of such as are Commis-  
“ sioned, but in an obstinate perverse Resistance  
“ against CHRIST’s Spiritual Vicegerents, un-  
“ dervaluing and trampling upon that Autho-  
“ rity



“ rity wherewith he has invested them.” These Hereticks, after they were deprived of all Divine Commission by CHRIST’S Spiritual Vicegerents, without receiving any other Commission from them, in Opposition to, and Rebellion against them, took upon them the Sacerdotal Office of Baptizing, without Authority, and against Authority, and yet the Primitive Church received the Baptisms of these Usurpers as valid, so far as not to repeat the Outward Form by Rebaptization. Now then, according to our Author’s way of arguing, the Primitive Church was guilty of abetting and encouraging Heretical and Schismatical Usurpers, because she so far allowed the validity of their Baptisms. But if this be a Slander upon the Primitive Church, then it is equally so upon all those who maintain the validity of Usurpers Baptism, no farther than the Primitive Church did; who put no Sacerdotal Authority into the hands of Hereticks and Schismatics (as our Author does) but take it away from them; who ascribe no Spiritual Effects to Heretical or Unauthorized Baptisms, but call upon Men to reconcile themselves to the Church, in order to be made Partakers of Grace and Salvation. This is not to abett or encourage Hereticks, or Schismatics, or Usurpers, but to lay the due weight and load of their Crimes upon them; to condemn their Usurpations, to deny their Authority, and exhort them to forsake a bad and unauthorized way, and return to the true authorized and effectual way of the Church. Which shews how much our Author overshot himself in his Zeal, when he went about to form such a groundless and false Accusation against his Innocent Brethren, that reflects Dishonour upon the

the



the Church of *England*, and the whole Catholic Church, and even upon himself too, who stands up for the Sacerdotal Authority of those Hereticks, whom the ancient Church declared to be no Priests, but Usurpers. And this is the only Observation and Remark I have occasion to make upon his first Chapter.

He begins his Second Chapter with saying, "That I grant the thing disputed for, as a Divine, but deny it as an Historian, because I say, a Power or Commission to Authorize Men to baptize was necessary to preserve the Church according to the order of CHRIST in future Ages." This Author has a notable Talent of finding out Contradictions where there are none. For wherein do I make my Divinity and History contradict one another? If it was the Order of CHRIST, that there should be a standing Ministry in his Church, Authorized to baptize, then it was necessary, there should be some Persons still in Commission to Authorize such a Ministry to baptize: This I call observing the Order or Rule which CHRIST has appointed in his Church, to preserve it with such an Authorized standing Ministry in it: But now if some Men who are not Authorized, take upon them to baptize without Commission, and the Church thinks fit not to repeat the Outward Form of Baptism given by such Usurpers; does that make it unnecessary, either that there should be a standing Authorized Ministry, or that there should be those who have Commission to Authorize others, because a Valid Baptism may be given, so far as concerns the Outward Form, sometimes by an Usurper? I believe the Primitive Church understood the Order of CHRIST



as well as any of us: But yet she did not think, that because she admitted the Baptisms of Hereticks and Schismaticks, who were destitute of a Commission, that therefore there was no necessity of a standing Authorized Ministry, or of Persons in Commission to Authorize others to baptize according to the Order of CHRIST, because there were some that baptized without the Authority of the Church, and so against his Order; But she thought these two things might consist together; the Outward Form of Baptism administred sometimes by Unauthorized Persons, did not destroy the General Necessity of a standing Authorized Ministry in the Church. So that whatever Contradiction our Author fancies in my Accounts, as an Historian and a Divine, will unavoidably fall as much upon the Catholick Church, and an equal Charge be brought against her Judgment on the one hand, and her Practice on the other. And in such Society I shall not be concerned to fall under our Author's Censure.

His next Discourse against the Author, under the Name of *St. Ambrose*, p. 6. I pass over, because as I laid no stress upon him before, so I intend to multiply no Disputes about him. But our Author says,

p. 10. "That I found the Principle of Bishops  
"Power to Authorize Laymen to baptize upon  
"the pretended Relation of that Author. Which is a wrong Information, that may perhaps satisfy such of his Readers, as intend to read his Book, and not mine: But it will satisfy no others: For I found nothing upon the Fact as related

## §. 2.

*That some Discretionary Power was supposed to be in the Hands of Bishops in Commissioning Persons to baptize.*



lated by that Author, but only say, The Ancients went upon the same Principle, which I prove another way : My Words are these, “ Tho’  
 “ no other Writer among the Ancients has so  
 “ plainly expressed his Mind upon this Point,  
 “ as this Author under the Name of St. *Ambrose*;  
 “ yet it is plain, all of them, who maintained  
 “ the Power of Bishops to Authorize Deacons  
 “ and Laymen to baptize, or, at their Discre-  
 “ tion, to restrain them from it, must needs go  
 “ upon the same Principle, *viz.* That such a  
 “ Power was lodged in the Hands of the Bishops  
 “ of the Church, as the Apostles Successors, to  
 “ Authorize what Men should baptize, and in  
 “ what Cases, according as they should think  
 “ necessary in their Wisdom and Discretion, for  
 “ the greater or lesser Exigencies of the Church:  
 “ And I there give this reason for it, Because  
 “ without this Principle it will be impossible to  
 “ account for the Practice of the ancient Bishops,  
 “ who sometimes restrained Deacons from Bap-  
 “ tizing as well as Laymen, and sometimes  
 “ granted Authority to them both.” *Scholast. Hist. p. 5.* Now our Author had done much better, if he had accounted for those Practices of the Ancients some other way, since he did not like the Account which I gave, rather than Criticize upon mine so causelessly and to so little purpose.

## §. 3.

*Whether Deacons  
 were accounted Priests  
 and the Ordinary and  
 Standing Ministers of  
 Baptism.*

But this is not the only false Criticism our Author is guilty of in the same place. For he asks immediately, “ Why are  
 “ Deacons here ranked with  
 “ Laymen, among those who  
 “ are not standing Ministers to Baptize? Did  
 “ not



“ not Mr. *Bingham* reckon them before as Stand-  
“ ing Ministers? P. 3. I answer, No; I only  
said, They had a Commission from the Apostles  
to baptize; but whether that was for Ordinary  
or Extraordinary Cases I determined not; *Phi-*  
*lip's* baptizing the Eunuch, was in an Extraordi-  
nary Case, when no one else could do it: And  
a Commission for such a Case does not make a  
Man a standing Ordinary Minister of Baptism;  
otherwise Laymen, who had a Commission for  
Extraordinary Cases, would have been Standing  
Ministers. But he says, P. 17. I was of another  
Opinion when I wrote my *Origines*, for there I  
call Deacons, Priests, and shew from *Optatus* and  
*Dr. Hicks*, that Bishops, Presbyters, and Dea-  
cons, had all their share in the Christian Priest-  
hood. He cites abundance of my Words, but he  
forgets one thing, That I was then delivering  
the Opinion of the Ancients on both sides the  
Question, and that I said the Opinion of *Opta-*  
*tus* was not the general and received Opinion,  
but that which prevailed most, was, That they  
were not Priests but Levites. Here I shall be  
constrained to transcribe a Paragraph in my *Ori-*  
*gines*, which our Author was pleased to overlook.  
The very Title of it is, That Deacons were not  
generally called Priests, but Ministers and Le-  
vites; And the Words are as follows, “ That  
“ I may not seem to impose upon my Readers,  
“ I must observe, that the Name of Priest was  
“ not generally given to the Deacons, by those  
“ that esteemed them a Sacred Order; but they  
“ are commonly distinguished from Priests, by  
“ the Names of Ministers and Levites. Thus  
“ *St. Jerom* distinguishes them from the Priests  
“ of the Second Order, that is, from the Pres-  
“ byters, by the Title of Levites. The Author  
D d “ of



“ of the Questions upon the Old and New Te-  
“ stament, under the Name of St. *Austin*, and  
“ *Hilarius Sardus* under the Name of St. *Ambrose*,  
“ are more Positive and Express in denying them  
“ the Name of Priests. *Non sunt Sacerdotes*. And  
“ *Salvian*, tho’ he acknowledges their Minистра-  
“ tion and Function to be about Holy Things,  
“ yet he gives them but the same Title of Levites,  
“ and that in Contradistinction to the Priests.  
“ And so frequently in the Councils, the Names  
“ *Sacerdos*, and *Levita*, are used as the peculiar  
“ distinguishing Titles of Presbyters and Dea-  
“ cons. The fourth Council of *Carthage* speaks  
“ more expressly, that Deacons are not ordained  
“ to the Priesthood, but only to the Ministering  
“ Office, or Inferior Service, &c. whence some  
“ Learned Men (*Habertus* and Bishop *Fell*) con-  
“ clude, against *Optatus* and St. *Austin*, that Dea-  
“ cons were in no Sense allowed to be Priests:  
“ Whilst others (*Rigaltius* and Dr. *Hicks*) with  
“ *Optatus*, distinguish the several Degrees of the  
“ Priesthood, and reckon, that tho’ Deacons  
“ were not absolutely called Priests, because  
“ that was the appropriate Title of Bishops and  
“ Presbyters, whose Ministers and Attendants  
“ they were; yet Deacons sometimes performed  
“ such Offices, as did entitle them to a lower  
“ Degree of the Priesthood. Having thus fair-  
“ ly stated and represented the matter on both  
“ sides, I must leave the judicious Reader to de-  
“ termine for himself, which Opinion has the  
“ strongest Reasons.” *So far my Origines. Book*  
*II. Chap. 20. n. 2. p. 259.* By which the Reader  
may now judge, how far I contradict myself  
when I say, the Ancients did not generally al-  
low Deacons to be Priests, nor the Ordinary  
Ministers of Baptism. For ’tis plain they were  
divided



divided about these Matters, and the greatest part held the Negative side of the Questions: And so many of them as did not believe Deacons to be Priests, nor the Ordinary Ministers of Baptism, and yet allowed them, in some Cases, to baptize, could not, surely, think the hand of a Priest so indispensably necessary in all Cases, as that it could be no Baptism, if given by any other Person, unless they spake egregious Contradictions. But I believe our Author takes the Words, Priest and Sacerdotal Power, in a larger Sense than those Ancients did, who distinguished Priests from Deacons, as our Church does also when she distinguishes the three Orders, of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons: For he makes every Man a Priest, and invested with Sacerdotal Powers, who has the Bishop's Commission to baptize, either in Ordinary or Extraordinary Cases whatsoever. For he says in his Preface, P. 17. "If there can be any such thing as the  
" giving of a real Authority to Laymen to baptize, then, when Authorized, they'll cease,  
" in that respect, to be Laymen, having (if  
" they can have) a Sacerdotal Power to baptize  
" in want of the Clergy; which will make such  
" their Baptisms to be Sacerdotal, Authorized  
" Baptisms, and so not properly Lay-Baptisms."

Now so long as we are thus divided about Terms, we are but Disputing and Wrangling in the dark about Priest and Priesthood to no purpose. The Ancients commonly mean by a Priest, a Presbyter, who, in his Ordination, receives a Sacerdotal Power not belonging to a Deacon; and the Ordinary Ministration of Baptism is by most of them made part of this Power: But our Author, by a Priest, understands any one who has a Commission to baptize in any



Case whatsoever, as well a Deacon and a Layman (supposing him to have received such a Commission) as a Presbyter, whom the Church has used to call a Priest in opposition to a Deacon. And whilst the Ancients mean one thing by a Priest, and our Author another, it is better to dismiss this Dispute, and come to something that is more certain; to take Priest in our Author's Notion, and then enquire, Whether none but a Person in Commission can administer the Outward Form of Baptism so far Valid as not to need to be repeated?

## §. 4.

*That many Un-commissioned Baptisms were anciently confirmed by Bishops without Rebaptizing.*

'Tis a Maxim with our Author, *Pag. 10.* "No Power, "no Baptism; no Commission in the Administrator, "no Baptism in the Receiver. Upon which he challenges me and all the World, *Pag. 11.* to produce any Instances of such Baptisms pretended to be confirmed by Bishops, where the Commission (which he calls essential) was wanting. Again he repeats his Challenge, *Pag. 12.* "What Presbyters among the Ancients did ever offer to "baptize, as Absolute and Independant of Bishops. Mr. Bingham has not produced any "ancient Instance of such modern Rebels: No, "the Schismatics of old adhered to, and depended upon some Bishop or other." Now I have answered this Challenge, as Providence would have it, before it was made: For I have shewed, that the Irregularity of the ancient Hereticks and Schismatics consisted in the want of Commission: For their Commission was taken from them; and then it is all one as if they never had any Commission at all: As he that loses



loses his Eyes, is as much blind, and without Eyes, as he that never had any Eyes at all. I have proved this so substantially in the foregoing Discourse, that it effectually silences all his little Quibbles that follow in the next Pages about Circumstantial and Essential Irregularities: For the want of a Commission is (according to him) an essential Irregularity in a Priest or Presbyter. But why then do I call such an one a Presbyter, when he is out of Commission? Why, only to give him some Name to know him by: For I agree he is no true Presbyter, when he is out of Commission. And therefore it is no such hard matter to come by my Meaning, as he pretends it to be, *Pag.* 14. I mean, one who once had the Commission of a Presbyter, but afterward was deprived of it for his Heresy and Schism, by the Authority and Discipline of the Church, whose Act of Ministration is sinful in this very Act, because now he acts without Commission. This is the Presbyter I am enquiring about, what validity there was in Baptisms administred by him, after he had lost his Commission, and set up to act against the Authority of his Bishop or the Church, that had taken his Commission from him. He was now no Real Presbyter, but only in Name, because he had lost his Commission. How then came his Baptisms to be reputed valid for all that, when he was Unauthorized and Uncommissioned? That is my Enquiry. And now let our Author mistake my Meaning again if he can. He must now say, either there never was an Heretical or Schismatical Presbyter so deprived of Commission in the ancient Church; or, that his Baptisms given after such Deprivation, were never receiyed as valid. Either of which



will be to purpose, if he can really make them good, against so many Evidences, and so authentically attested, as I have given to the contrary. But nothing short of this will signify any thing in the present Case, where we are enquiring about the validity of Baptisms given by Uncommissioned Persons.

S. 5.

*The necessary distinction of the Ancients, between an Authoritative and a meerly Valid Baptism confounded by our Author.*

Our Author's Hypothesis will not suffer him to distinguish between an Authorized Baptism, and a meer Valid Baptism, because he thinks all Baptism null and void that is given without Authority. But the Ancients distinguished betwixt these two sorts of Baptism, and reckoned the one to be founded on the Lawful Authority of the Administrator, but the other not so. Therefore our Author only trifles and imposes upon himself and his Readers, *Pag. 16.* when he charges me with Inconsistencies and Contradictions, because when I speak of Authoritative Baptism, I say the Ancients founded it upon a Commission; and when I speak of meer valid Baptism, I say they did not found it upon Sacerdotal Powers; because they reckoned the Baptisms of an Heretical or Schismatical Priest, who was deprived of his Commission, to be valid notwithstanding: Which things, in the Opinion of the Ancients, were fairly consistent together. But then he says, *Pag. 20.* "If I would have done any thing here to the Purpose, I should have produced Authorities, who allowed of the validity of Baptism in the Name of the Trinity, administered by Heretical, Schismatical, and other Irregular Priests; I should have given an History



“ History of such Ancients, nulling and making  
“ void the Commission of those Priests during  
“ their Heresy, Schism, or other Irregularity :  
“ But as yet I have given no such Instance, and  
“ he is confident I never will. For ’tis notori-  
“ ous, that those ancient Churches which al-  
“ lowed of the validity of those Baptisms, did  
“ also acknowledge the Holy Orders of the  
“ Baptizers, and esteemed their Episcopal Or-  
“ dination to be good and valid.” Now the  
Reader will best judge of this, when he has  
considered the Evidences I have produced in the  
foregoing Discourse, to prove Hereticks, and  
Schismatics, and Degraded Priests to be de-  
prived of their Commission; to be no true  
Priests of GOD in that state of Deprivation,  
but Unauthorized and Uncommissioned Priests,  
or Laymen. The two Authorities our Author  
produces, *Pag. 21.* out of the Council of *Nice*  
and the *African Codex*, are nothing to his pur-  
pose: For they do not say, that Hereticks and  
Schismatics were allowed to be true Autho-  
rized and Commissioned Priests, during their  
Heresy or Schism, but that they should be ad-  
mitted to officiate in the Clerical State, upon  
their return to the Church; and then they had  
the Churches Commission, which they had been  
deprived of during their Heresy or Schism:  
And this was only a particular Favour allowed  
to the *Novatians* and *Donatists*, by way of In-  
dulgence and Dispensation with the common  
Rule, which was to keep Hereticks and Schif-  
matics for ever deprived of Clerical Promoti-  
ons and Sacerdotal Powers. But our Author,  
being ignorant of the strictness of Discipline  
in the ancient Church, did not distinguish be-  
tween her common and ordinary Rule, and



the particular Indulgences and Dispensations that were granted in some Cases, when the Necessities of the Church required her to relax a little of her usual Severity and Discipline; which She did in the Case of the *Novatians* and *Donatists*, to encourage them to return to the Unity of the Church; not allowing them to have been true Priests, whilst they were out of the Church, but favouring them with a Lawful Commission, when they returned into her Bosom; which Favour was denied generally to other Hereticks, who still stood deprived of their Commission for their former Rebellions and Oppositions to her, even after they were Reconciled, and admitted to Lay-Communion; of which I have given numerous Instances in the foregoing Discourse.

It will therefore stand good against our Author, that those Ancient Hereticks and Schismatics were deprived of their Commission, during their Heresy and Schism: And then, according to his own Principles and Confession, they were no Priests in that State, when their Commission was taken away by that very Authority, that is, the Episcopal Power which first gave it. I will put the whole Issue of the Debate upon this single Point: For he and I are now well agreed, that the Merits of the Cause are contained in it. So that if it appears, that the Sacerdotal Power and Commission of those ancient Hereticks and Schismatics was actually taken from them by the same Episcopal Power which first gave it; then our Author professes he will own, that they were no longer Authorized Priests by vertue of any Indelible or Indeleter Character remaining in them. For our Author in this is more Ingenious and Favourable to the Protestant Cause than



than some others.: He owns that the Character of a Priest may be so far deleted or blotted out for his Crimes, that all Actual Power, Authority, Commission, and Rights of a Priest, may be taken from him, by the same Competent Power which first invested him with them. 'And if it be undeniably proved, that this was actually the Case of the ancient Hereticks and Schismatics, as I am confident it is proved by the best of Evidences in the foregoing Discourse, as clear as the Sun at Noon-Day; then the Ground of the Dispute is entirely at an end, and our Author will confess, that Baptism was anciently given by such Unauthorized and Irregular Priests as had actually no Commission.

And therefore, for this Reason, I will wave at present making any farther Reflections upon our Author's Account of ancient History; not because he has said any thing of Moment to take off the Force of the Arguments and Authorities I urged to prove my several Assertions, but because the Method he and I are now agreed upon, is a more likely and compendious way to terminate this Dispute, by bringing matters to a single Point, and examining the truth of that by the most publick Acts and authentick Records of the Church. Here we shall have no such great occasion to wrangle about Private Authors speaking their own Private Sense: ( Which is our Author's way of answering all that I have said in two Words, tho' he himself obliges the World with no other Authors: ) For the Councils will be allowed on all hands to be the Publick Voice of the Church, and therefore, to mak speedy Dispatch of this Dispute and bring it to a short Issue, I have chosen to prove my Thesis from the Proceedings of the General and  
Pro-



Provincial Councils against Hereticks and Schismatics, which are Proofs that are liable to no Exceptions of this kind, so long as they are the Genuine Acts of the Councils they pretend to be, and are understood by us in the Genuine Sense and Meaning of them. Let these then be the Dernier Resort and final Enquiry, as to what concerns ancient History upon this Point, between me and this Author. And let him remember, that the only Question now is, Whether the ancient Hereticks and Schismatics had not their Commission vacated by the same Episcopal Power and Authority which at first gave it? If the Reader desires to see an Answer to what this Author urges from *St. Jerom*, *St. Basil*, and *St. Chrysostom* (which are the only Authorities that seem to carry any Colour of an Argument in them) he may find it in the entrance of the foregoing Discourse, where I state the Controversy with *Dr. Brett*, and shew how he mistakes the Sense of each of them; and particularly, that *Basil's* Opinion, of Hereticks being divested of their Commission and made Laymen, is agreeable to the Sense of the whole Catholick Church, and therefore utterly Destructive of our Author's contrary Notion and Assertion.



## C H A P. IV.

*Of the Greek Church, and the Churches  
of the Reformation.*

I Have now but one thing more to consider with our Author, which is the Reflections he makes upon the Account which I gave of the Modern Greek Church, and the Churches of the Reformation. I began my Account of the Modern Greek Church, with the Canons of *Nicephorus* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, who lived in the beginning of the Ninth Century : And I thought it was very proper to give an Account of the Modern Practice of the Greek Church from Modern Writers. But our Author takes occasion hence to observe, P. 212. “That for  
“the first Eight Hundred Years, that Church  
“had no Rule, Ecclesiastical Law, or Custom,  
“whereby to determine the Pretended Validity  
“of any Lay-Baptisms whatsoever.” I hope by this time our Author is a little better informed and satisfied, when he has considered how many ancient General Councils, during that Term of 800 Years, by their Ecclesiastical Laws and Rules, determined the Validity of Heretical Baptism ; and how many of the same Councils, with many others, determined likewise, that those very Hereticks were deprived of all Sacerdotal Power, Authority, and Commission, and consequently  
in

S. I.

*That the ancient  
Greek Church had  
several Laws before  
the Eighth Century,  
determining the Vali-  
dity of Uncommis-  
sioned Lay-Baptism.*



in the State of Unauthorized Laymen ; as I had sufficiently intimated in the former part of my *Scholastical History*, and have now more substantially proved in this. Therefore his Harangue about the great Extent of the *Greek Church*, and how significant a part it was of the *Catholick Church*, is only against himself; tho' he designed it as a specious Pretext to impose upon his Readers. And for the Authorities of *St. Basil* and *St. Chrysostom*, which are so often produced for the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, I have shewed before in stating the Controversy with *Dr. Brett*, that they make nothing to his Purpose.

## §. 2.

*The Authority of the Canons of Nicephorus vindicated from our Author's Exceptions.*

He next runs out against *Nicephorus*, as a Zealous Promoter of the Superstition of Image Worship, and says, P. 214. "That his Authority  
" is of no more value in this  
" Case of Lay-Baptism, than it is in the other,  
" of the use of Images in Divine Worship." I did not desire it to be of any greater value: I produced it only to determine a Question of Fact, not of Right, Whether Lay-Baptism, in any Case, was then allowed in the *Greek Church*? The Question was not, Whether it was Lawful or Unlawful in it self, but whether it was then the Practice of the *Greek Church*: And his Testimony is sufficient to decide this to be their Practice, tho' their Practice might chance to be against a Divine Law, which is another Question. So if the Question had been about Image-Worship, as to Fact only, Whether it was then set up in the *Greek Church*; the Testimony of *Nicephorus*, or the Second Council of *Nice*, had been good in this Case to have proved the Fact, tho' not sufficient  
to



to have justified the Lawfulness of the Practice. But our Author cunningly confounds these Questions of Fact and Right together, and labours artificially to work his Reader into an ill Opinion of *Nicephorus*, only to ruine his Credit as an Historian.

But if this will not succeed, he would have his Reader believe, these Canons were only the Private Dictates of *Nicephorus*, not made in any Authentick Council at all. P. 215. especially not in the Council of 270 Bishops *An. 814*. I am not much concerned what Council they were made in, tho' I think it as likely to be in the Council of 270 Bishops as any other. But that is not the Question. Were they not Canons of the *Greek* Patriarch? And were the Canons of the Patriarch of no force in the *Greek* Church? If not, how came *Harmenopulus* to make use of them as Canon-Law, in a Collection of Rules to direct Men in their Practice? This one Reason is of more Weight with me than all our Authors little Criticisms to the contrary; Who, if *Nicephorus* and his Canons had been for his Turn, could have said as many pretty things in their Favour, as now he does to their Prejudice, only to bias his Reader against them. He could have said, That Patriarchs did not use to make Canons but in Synod; Or if otherwise, yet their Power was so ample and extensive, that their Canons were of Force through all the Churches under their Jurisdiction. But now these Canons are not the declared Authentick Sense of the *Greek* Church; and that for another Reason, P. 220. Because some *Greek* Writers wrote boldly against the Lawfulness of Lay-Baptism in any Case whatsoever, which it is reasonable to believe they would have been more tender of Opposing,



posing, if it had been the general Sense and Practice of the *Greek Church*. As if our Author, or I, or our Readers, knew none at this Day, who Write boldly against the approved Lawful Sense and Practice of the Church of *England*, without any Tendernefs for the standing Rules and Orders of the Church. 'Tis low Waters with a Man, and his Invention is almost exhausted, when he is forced to make use of such pretty Arguments as these.

But he returns upon us again with *St. Basil*, *St. Chrysostom*, and the whole *Greek Church*, for 800 Years. P. 221. In answer to which, I have shewed him before, that *St. Basil's* Canons, which he says were part of the Canon-Law of the *Greek Church*, pronounce Hereticks to be no more than Laymen: And the *Greek Church* for 800 Years did the same; and yet received the Baptisms of those Laymen without Rebaptization. Which is another sort of Demonstration of the Sense and Practice of the *Greek Church*, than any our Author pretends to give us.

At last he comes to the poor shift, to tell his Readers, Pag. 221. that *Nicephorus* was wrought upon by the Emissaries of the Church of *Rome*, to introduce this Novelty into the *Greek Church*; “And that gave just occasion to others of the  
“*Greek Church*, who were jealous for the  
“Truths of Christianity, to give that Church  
“timely warning of dangerous *Romish* Novelties  
“creeping in among them; of which number  
“*Georgius Hamartolus*, *Glycas*, and *Theodorus Scutariota*, appear to have been, in vigorously  
“opposing the pretended Lawfulness of Lay-  
“Baptism, which was first started only in the  
“*Latin Church*.” This pretence of being wrought upon by *Romish* Emissaries, serves our  
Author



Author at all Turns, when he has nothing else to say to lessen the Credit, or elude the Testimony of any Writer; and we shall have more of it by and by, against the modern *Greeks*. Here I observe only, how he gives Characters of Men, just as they seem to favour or not favour his own Opinions. The Authority of *Nicephorus* was not worth a Straw, because he was a zealous Defender of Image-Worship; But *Hamartolus* and *Glycas*, tho' they were as zealous Defenders of Image-Worship as *Nicephorus*, are honest Men, jealous for the Truths of Christianity, only because they vigorously opposed the pretended Lawfulness of Lay-Baptism. When Men can be thus partial in giving Characters of Men, I think it matters not much, what they say for or against them: And therefore the Canons of *Nicephorus* will stand good still, as Rules for the *Greek Church*, notwithstanding all these little Pleas of our Author against them.

In the Year 1166, I observed there was a Council at *Constantinople*, which denied the validity of Baptism given by Pretended or False Priests, who counterfeited Orders, pretending to be Priests when they were not so. Our Author, upon this, says, I can produce no Councils for 1200 Years that would have determined otherwise than this Council did in this Matter; when yet I have shewed him, that most of the ancient Councils said, Hereticks were no Priests, but False Priests, pretending to be Priests when they were not so; and yet they did not order such Persons as were baptized by them, to be Rebaptized, as this Council did. I said farther

S. 3.  
Our Author's dis-  
ingenuous way of an-  
swering the Modern  
Greek Writers.

con-



concerning the Decree of this Council, That it had not said any thing particularly about the Invalidity of Laymens Baptism in extraordinary Cases of absolute Necessity ; and therefore it might consist with the Canons of *Nicephorus*, which only respected such Cases. To this our “ Author replies, That the Power of Baptizing “ was committed only to those who were vested “ with a Priestly Power, and Laicks have no “ such Power or Authority given them.” P.230. But now our Author forgets what he had so often asserted before, “ That upon supposition “ a Layman could have the Bishops Authority “ and Commission to baptize in an Extraordi- “ nary Case of Necessity, he would, in that “ Act, and for that time, so far be a Priest, and “ invested with Sacerdotal Power, and not be “ in that Act a meer Uncommissioned Layman.” And why might not this *Greek* Council be of our Author’s Mind, and think Laymen that were Commissioned to baptize in a particular Case, to be Priests in that Act, and not meer Laymen? And if so, there is no Contradiction between the Canons of *Nicephorus* and this Council. For they both allow the Baptisms of Men invested with Sacerdotal Powers.

But however it was, I shewed that the *Greeks* practised according to the Rules given in the Canons of *Nicephorus* to this Day, and this I proved from undoubted Evidences of Historians and others, who give an account of their Practice. To smother which glaring Evidence, our Author first betakes himself to his usual Art of lessening the Authority of the Witnesses, by saying, Pag. 236. “ They were no more than “ particular Men, and their Authority of no “ Importance.” As if a number of credible Histo-



Historians agreeing together, were not sufficient Authority to shew us what was the Practice of any Church, when the Question was only about a matter of Fact, and not Right; and no contrary Evidence is so much as pretended to confront or contradict them. But 'tis very notorious, our Author says, 2<sup>dly</sup>, "That in these  
"latter Ages the *Greeks* are, by the Craft and  
"Subtilty of the *Romish* Emissaries, divided into  
"two Parties." Why did he not then produce the Testimony of some of that Party, who were against the *Popish Doctrine*, as he calls it, of allowing Laymen to baptize in Case of Necessity? Or why did he not prove particularly of the Authors I produced, that they were influenced or bribed by the Jesuits to deliver false History in favour of the *Romish* Pretensions? Were they divided into two Parties upon this Point, and yet all wrote unanimously on one Side only? Or how does he prove that those that wrote, were all in the *Romish* Interest? He entertains his Readers, by way of Blind, with a long Story about the Jesuits usage of *Cyrellus Lucaris*, which is nothing to the purpose. For this Author is not concerned in the Dispute, one way or other. He should have shewed, that the Testimony of *Jeremy* the Patriarch was gained only by the Art of some *Romish* Emissaries. Instead of this he tell us, "The Patriarch was displeased with  
"the *Lutherans*, for believing Invocation of  
"Saints to be vain and frivolous, and for  
"despising that Adoration which was paid to  
"their Images and Holy Relicks." *Pag.* 238. And what then? Is it likely, that he who was displeased at the *Lutherans*, would have represented the Practice of the *Greek Church*, as agreeing with the *Lutherans*, if it was really otherwise?

E e



therwise? Nothing can be more improbable than this: And therefore I cannot but imagine our Author was in a sort of Maze and Confusion when he wrote it, since nothing could have been said more directly against his Purpose. But he adds, “Mr. *Bingham* might with as good a Grace have produced that Patriarch’s Testimony for these *Popish* Corruptions, Invocation of Saints, and Adoration of Images, and Relicks, as for the other.” And where had been the harm of that, I pray, if any one had made a Question, Whether Invocation of Saints, and the Worship of Images had been the Practices of the *Greek* Church? Could we have had a better Evidence for Matter of Fact in such a Case, than the Testimony of one of their own Patriarchs? Does not our Author himself quote a *Greek* Council, and some others before that, for the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism? And why might he not with as good a Grace have produced the same Authors for the Worship of Saints and Images? No doubt he might, if the Question had been only, Whether Saints and Images had then been Worshipped in the *Greek* Church? Their Testimony in this Case, to determine a Matter of Fact, had been as good and certain as any other. Why then does he quarrel with me for doing that which any one may do, and which he himself has done, without any Offence or Imputation? I know not, in truth, how he should determine Matters of Fact, unless from such Authors as have particularly wrote about them.

After he has lashed the Patriarch, he turns off all the other Instances I gave, by saying, p. 238. “That they are of so Modern a Date, that we have reason to believe, they are no better than



“than the meer Effects of some *Greeks*, being  
“too much infected with the Superstitions of the  
“Church of *Rome*.” If these Modern *Greeks* had  
been of his Side, then they had not been too  
Modern for his Purpose. But if they were only  
some *Greeks* infected with the Romish Superstiti-  
ons, why did he not produce others not infected  
with them, to tell us what was the Practice of  
the Non-infected *Greek Church* in the Point of  
Lay-baptism? As it happens, our Author is very  
unlucky in his Observations on the Character of  
these Modern *Greeks*. For the chief of those  
Writers, which I quoted, were so far from be-  
ing Latinized *Greeks*, that they were profest Op-  
posers of the Romish Usurpations. *Gabriel Seve-*  
*rus* Archbishop of *Philadelphia* is often railed at  
by *Leo Allatius* for Writing in defence of the  
*Greeks* against the *Latins*, and particularly against  
the Pope’s Supremacy, which is the grand Usur-  
pation and Corruption of the Romish Church.  
It was a little unfortunate therefore in our Au-  
thor, so carelessly and without considering, to  
rank that Archbishop among those *Greeks* that  
were Favourers of the Romish Church, when  
he was so great a Stickler against it. He is no  
happier in applying his Character to *Metrophanes*  
*Critopulus*: For this Writer was out of the reach  
of Romish Emissaries and Jesuits: He was a Stu-  
dent in *Oxford*, sent into *England* by *Cyrillus Lu-*  
*caris*, and by him recommended to the Protection  
and Patronage of Archbishop *Abbot*, who will  
not be suspected to have instilled into him any  
of the Romish Corruptions. How then could  
our Author with any Modesty say, The rest of  
the Instances I had given were out of Latinized  
*Greeks*, when it is so plain they were most dire-  
ctly contrary? And why would he not vouch-



safe his Readers one Modern *Greek* Writer, Latinized or Unlatinized, that gave a different Account from what I did of the present Practice of the *Greek* Church? That had been the fair way of answering, by confronting and disproving my Authorities by better and more credible Allegations. But he knew this was not to be attempted, and yet resolving to outface the Sun at Noon-Day, he betakes himself to another Method, to invalidate the Evidence by falling foul upon the Character and Reputation of the Persons: Which yet proves as unfortunate, as it was disingenuous; for the Persons he assaults were Men of a quite different Party and Character to what he represents and labours to fasten on them; being no Latinized *Greeks*, but stiff Opposers of the *Romish* Church in all the ancient Points controverted between them.

Commend me now rather to the honest Ingenuity of Dr. *Brett*, who being sensible there was no withstanding so many undeniable Evidences and unquestionable Allegations, chose rather to confess he had nothing to oppose or say against them, for want of Books to make a just Enquiry. But this Author would not so give up the Cause; he pretends there was a Party among the *Greeks*, the true Unlatinized *Greeks*, that would Depose and Vouch for him: But when he comes to produce his Authorities and tell the Evidence, there is not one appears in his Behalf; even the Unlatinized *Greeks*, as well as the rest, are all against him. And therefore with what Success this bold Undertaker has adventured to advance one Step farther than Dr. *Brett*, and walk where he thought it not safe to tread, I now leave to the Judgment of every sensible and Ingenuous Reader.



S. 4.

*That the Reason of the Greeks Practice was not their Opinion of the Absolute Necessity of Baptism for Dying Infants.*

I have but one Remark more to make upon our Author in relation to the Modern Greek Church. He says, P. 239. "That the Reason of this Practice of some of the Greeks, is the uncharitable and cruel Opinion, which some of the Romanists hold of Infants dying without Baptism, and which those Greeks have learned from them." Now our Author knows very well, that this Opinion about Infants was the Doctrine of St. *Austin* and other *Latin* Fathers, long before the *Roman* Popish Writers were in being: For he himself charges St. *Austin* with it, and reckons it the Reason also why he allowed Laymen to baptize in Case of Necessity. Why then might not the *Greeks* have it from St. *Austin*, as well as from the Fryars and Jesuits of the *Romish* Church? But the Opinion of the absolute Necessity of Baptism for dying Infants was not the reason of allowing Laymen to baptize: For Laymen were allowed to baptize Adult Persons, as well as Infants, in Cases of Necessity; and yet St. *Austin* had not that Opinion of the absolute Necessity of Baptism for Adult Persons, that he is commonly supposed to have of it for Infants; because he particularly excepts two sorts of Adult Persons, as the rest of the *Catholick* Writers commonly do, from the Severity of the Sentence, viz. 1. Such Catechumens as died Martyrs, baptized in their own Blood: And, 2. Such of them as made Profession of a true Faith and a sincere Repentance, and died without Baptism, not in any Contempt or Neglect of it, but by some extreme Necessity, which debarred them from it, when they most earnestly de-



fired it. They who represent *St. Austin's* Opinion otherwise, I will make bold to say, are ignorant of his Doctrine, which ought not to be spoken of without this necessary Distinction between Infants and Adult Persons. Now then to found the Opinion *St. Austin* had of the Lawfulness of Laymens Baptizing Adult Persons in Cases of Necessity, upon the Doctrine of the absolute Necessity of Baptism for Infants, is doing wrong to *St. Austin*, because it is certain, this Reason will not extend to Adult Persons, unless *St. Austin* had entertained the same Notion of them, as he did of others. And that he did not, I shall have occasion to shew very plainly in the next Volume of my *Origines*, which is now preparing for the Press. If then *St. Austin* did not found the Lawfulness of Laymens baptizing in Cases of Necessity upon the Opinion of the Absolute Necessity of Baptism for Infants, but upon some more General Reason, that equally extends to Adult Persons also; it is more than probable the *Greeks* did so too, as I shall be inclined to think, till I see better Reasons than any our Author has offered to the contrary.

But I will presume to ask our Author two Questions farther. 1. How he is assured, that this Uncharitable and Cruel Opinion about Infants dying without Baptism, was embraced by the *Greeks* at all? And, 2. Why he ascribes it only to some of them, and not to the rest? If he says, They must needs be of this Opinion, because they allowed Laymen to baptize in Cases of Necessity; I answer, That that is no Reason at all: For many Men allow Laymen to baptize in such Cases, who yet were never tainted with that Cruel Opinion: As the *Lutherans*, who hold, that Infants dying Unbaptized  
may



may be Saved as well as Adult Persons: And some of the *Romanists*, by his own Confession; for he makes this cruel Opinion not to be the Doctrine of all the *Romanists*, but only of some of them. If then some of the *Romanists*, and all the *Lutherans* could allow Laymen to baptize in Cases of Necessity, without making any such cruel Doctrine, about Infants dying Unbaptized, to be the Reason and Foundation of it, Why might not the *Greeks* do so too? Since it does not necessarily follow, that the Reason of allowing Laymen to baptize, is any such cruel Opinion, of Infants dying without Baptism. But admit some to be of this Opinion; How does it appear, that it is only the Opinion of some of the *Greeks*, and not of all? Our Author produces the Testimony of neither side, to make good his Assertion. And if he says, It must needs be so, because it was only some of the *Greeks* that allowed Laymen to baptize in Cases of Necessity, but not all of them: I have already shewed that to be false; for the Unlatinized *Greeks* allowed this Liberty to Laymen, as well as the Latinized: And therefore if the Reason of this Allowance was only the Cruel and Uncharitable Opinion of Infants dying Unbaptized, it must either be ascribed to them all or none. But whether they held this Opinion or not (which I dispute not with our Author) it is plain, this was not the necessary Reason of allowing Laymen to baptize, since that might be done without holding any such Cruel and Uncharitable Opinion. So little Strength or Solidity is there in any part of our Author's Account of the *Greek Churches*, either in Point of History, or in Point of Reason, after 30 Pages spent upon it.



§. 5.  
Of the Moscovite  
or Russian Churches.

Next for the *Moscovite* Churches, I gave an Instance of their Rule from one of the Canons of *John* their Metropolitan, which orders, That Children, in Case of Necessity, should be baptized without a Priest. Now, instead of confronting this, by producing some contrary Canons, he only says, P.241. "This was one single Man's Authority; "no Synod or Council mentioned wherein this "Canon was made." And that it was not the general Opinion of those Churches, he concludes from the contrary Practice of the People. But, till he produces some contrary Canon, of equal Weight and Force with this of their Metropolitan and Patriarch, his saying so will not pass for a sufficient Answer. He supposes this Metropolitan made an Innovation in the Church, and the People tenacious of their ancient Custom, would not submit to his novel Canon, or Injunction. But this is all Precarious, and a meer Supposition without Proof: Therefore it lies upon him to shew, that the *Moscovites*, who had their Religion from the Modern *Greeks*, had originally contrary Rules of Discipline settled in their Churches; and then it will look a little more probable that this *John*, whom they called their Prophet, was an Innovator; tho' still it will be something harsh and uncouth to join such disagreeable Epithets together, and give one and the same Man the Titles both of Prophet and Innovator. I should rather think, the Churches at first very readily complied with the Directions of their Prophet, but afterwards his Rules came to be neglected by the Degeneracy and Corruptions of the People. Our Author thinks otherwise: But till he produces some Authentick



thentick Canon to confront this, I cannot come in to his Opinion.

Next for the *Lutheran* Churches, he owns the Account I gave of them to be true: But he says, P. 247. "They have no Catholick Principle whereon to found their Practice, and that their Reasons are very weak, insignificant and false," Which is not now the Question, for we are only considering Matters Historically, and so long as he owns what I delivered before to be true in Fact, we will enter into no farther Dispute about them.

§. 6.

*No farther Dispute about the Lutheran Churches.*

For the same Reason we need not stand about the Opinion of *Zwinglius* or the *Helvetick* Churches: For he acknowledges the Account to be true; only he cries out, *Popery, Popery!* because no Prohibition was laid upon Men in Cases of Necessity, nor any Order made for Rebaptizing those who were Irregularly baptized by others. But if this be Popery, it was the Popery of the Primitive Church, which, neither by General or Provincial Council, laid any Prohibition upon Men in Cases of Necessity, nor made any Order for Rebaptizing those that were irregularly baptized by others; but, on the contrary, made many Orders both in General and Provincial Councils against Rebaptizing those that were baptized by Hereticks and Schismaticks, though those Hereticks and Schismaticks were determined to be no Authorized Priests, but Uncommissioned Laymen.

§. 7.

*Nor about Zwinglius and the Helvetian Churches.*

In



§. 8.  
That the Calvinists  
do, in some Cases, own  
the Validity of Lay-  
Baptism.

In stating the Opinion of Calvin, our Author finds several Faults with my Account. First, He says, I wrong translate Calvin's Words, *Adeoque ab ipso fere Ecclesiae exordio, usu receptum fuit, ut in periculo mortis Laici baptizarent, si minister in tempore non adesset*: This only implies a Received Custom, not a generally prevailing Custom, he says, That Laymen should baptize in danger of Death, and that not always, but only almost from the Beginning of the Church. But what difference there is between a Received Custom, and generally prevailing Custom, I think we had best leave to the Criticks to determine. If Calvin had expressed his Mind never so clearly, it would have weighed little with our Author: For he thinks Calvin was deceived, in allowing the Custom to be so early received as he fancied, that is, from near the beginning of the Church.

But, Secondly, He is very confident I am mistaken in saying, That Calvin does not peremptorily pronounce such Baptisms absolutely Null and Void, but the contrary: The Proof I gave of this was from the Words of Calvin, cited by Archbishop Whitgift, to the same Purpose, against Cartwright: Viz. It is sufficient for us to know the Hand and Seal of the Lord in his Sacraments, by whomsoever they be delivered. In answer to this, our Author says, P. 251. "That if the  
" Word *Whomsoever*, as Archbishop Whitgift has  
" it, must be taken in its full Extent and Mean-  
" ing, then Calvin will be made to esteem as  
" Good and Valid, all the pretended Baptisms of  
" Laymen and Women, Jews, Turks, Infidels,  
" and Pagans, which is plainly a Novelty of cor-  
" rupt Popery. And Calvin will be made to  
" speak



“ speak inconsistently with himself, and to con-  
 “ tradict his own Principle, which was, that  
 “ Lay-Baptism was not Lawful in any Case  
 “ whatsoever.” Our Author here again con-  
 founds Unauthorized and Invalid Baptism toge-  
 ther, and hence concludes, that because *Calvin*  
 thought all Lay-Baptism to be Unlawful, there-  
 fore he must needs think it absolutely Invalid,  
 and of Necessity to be repeated. Whereas he  
 was not of that Opinion, but thought, if it  
 had the Hand and Seal of the Lord, that is,  
 the Outward Form of Baptism duly administred,  
 it was not necessary to repeat it, especially in a  
 Confused and Disorderly State of the Church,  
 where many things were to be tolerated, which  
 were not proper to be endured in a well-re-  
 gulated and exactly Disciplined Church. He  
 did not think the Lawfulness of the Admini-  
 strator to be absolutely an Essential part of  
 Baptism, but only a necessary Circumstance,  
 which ought to be observed in all Well-Disci-  
 plined Churches; which yet might be dispensed  
 with in a Dissipated State of the Church; and  
 in such Cases, tho’ administred by Laymen, he  
 thought there was no necessity of Repeating it by  
 Rebaptization. Our Author has already been  
 shewed this by another Hand<sup>d</sup> out of one of  
*Calvin’s* Epistles<sup>e</sup>, part of which, I shall here  
 again transcribe. *Adulterinum Baptismum censemus,  
 qui administratus est à Privato homine; Ac in Eccle-  
 sia recte composita tolerabilis non esset hæc temeritas.  
 Sed quia id apud vos inter principia contigit, ante resti-  
 tutum Ecclesiæ Ordinem, & rebus adhuc confusis;*  
 non

<sup>d</sup> Letter to the Author of Lay-Baptism Invalid; by a Coun-  
 try Clergyman. Lond. 1713. P. 33.

<sup>e</sup> Calvin. Epist. p. 209. Edit. Amst. 1667.



*non tantum Errori danda est venia, sed ferendus est qualiscunque Baptismus, modo ne in exemplum trahatur, quod semel perperam gestum est. Nam in Ecclesiæ Dissipatione multa Deus condonat, quæ nullo modo admittere fas esset in Ecclesiam bene ordinatam. Olim cum vitiata esset Religio, haud dubie multis vitiis & corruptelis implicita Circumcisio fuit; quam tamen iteratam fuisse non legimus, quum Populus revocaretur ad purum cultum: Ergo anxie disquirere necesse non est, ac ne expedit quidem, in omnes Circumstantias, quæ innumeros scrupulos gignerent. Proinde quod ignoravit Deus sub Papatu, nos quoque sepe liamus. Nunc ubi de vero Baptismi usu admonita fuerit Ecclesia, quod pugnaret cum Christi Institutione, pro nihilo dicendum esset, ac de integro baptizandus, qui pollutus fuerit profana aspersione.* “We  
“ judge that Baptism to be adulterated or viti-  
“ ated, which is administred by a Private Man;  
“ and this Temerity in a well ordered Church  
“ ought not to be tolerated. But because this  
“ happened among you in the beginning of the  
“ Reformation, before the Order of the Church  
“ was well restored, and while things were in  
“ Confusion, this Error is not only to be par-  
“ doned, but any Baptism to be admitted, pro-  
“ vided the Irregularity of what was once done,  
“ be not drawn into Precedent or Example for  
“ the future. For in the Dissipation of the  
“ Church, God pardons many things that are  
“ not to be admitted of in a well ordered  
“ Church. Heretofore, when Religion was  
“ corrupted, no doubt many Faults and Cor-  
“ ruptions had crept into Circumcision; yet we  
“ do not read, that it was repeated, when the  
“ People were called back to the Purity of Re-  
“ ligion. It is therefore neither necessary nor  
“ Expedient to be too anxious in our Enquiries  
into



“into all Circumstances, which may raise in-  
“numerable Scruples. And therefore what  
“God pardoned under the Papacy, let us also  
“bury. Only now that the Church is instru-  
“cted in the true use of Baptism, what is re-  
“pugnant to CHRIST’s Institution, is to be ac-  
“counted as nothing; and he is to be baptized  
“again, who has been polluted by a Profane  
“Washing.”

Here it is plain *Calvin* does not make the Publick Minister so absolutely Necessary and Essential to Baptism, as that all Baptisms ministred by Private Men in all Cases, and especially in a grand Dissipation of the Church, are of Necessity to be repeated. For he advises against the Repetition of such Baptisms, as, in the Infancy of the Reformation, were given by Popish Laymen. But in a well-settled Church, his Opinion was, that by the Rules and Discipline of such a Church, such Baptisms should be ordered to be repeated.

And this, I shewed, also was the Opinion of Dr. *Alting*, an eminent Leader and Professor in the *Palatine* Churches, That Baptisms given by Laymen in some Exigencies, as that of a Dissipation of the Church, were not of necessity to be repeated. But our Author replies, P. 255.  
“What signifies the saying of one Man, when,  
“according to Mr. *Bingham*, the Churches of  
“the *Palatinate* commonly follow the contrary  
“Doctrine? And the Doctor talks inconsistently  
“with himself too, whilst he acknowledges the  
“same Baptism to be Illegitimate and Unlawful.  
Our Author uses here a great deal of his usual Artifice and Slight of Hand in this Answer. For he has an excellent Talent at Misrepresentation. 1<sup>st</sup>, He would perswade his Readers,  
that



that I say, The *Palatine* Churches commonly follow the contrary Doctrine to that which was delivered by *Alting*; when yet I say nothing of the *Palatine* Churches but what makes them plainly agree together. But 2<sup>dly</sup>, *Alting* was but one Man, and a Doctor of no Moment in this Affair. Yet our Author did not think fit to oblige his Reader with a Doctor of as little Moment to Confront him, or his Opinion, about the Validity of Lay-Baptism in time of Persecution, or Dissipation of the Church: In which Opinion he was not so singular as our Author imagines: For, as we see, he followed *Calvin* in the Resolution of this Point, and, in a manner, transcribed his Arguments taken from Circumcision, and Baptisms administered by Laymen, under the Papacy, which they both call Baptisms in a Dissipation of the Church. And this makes it probable to me, that this was then the current Doctrine both of the *Genevans* and the *Palatine* Churches. But he says, 3<sup>dly</sup>, That *Alting* contradicts himself, in Affirming such Baptisms to be Valid and not necessary to be repeated, whilst yet he acknowledges them to be Unlawful and Illegitimate, and therefore False and Invalid. But, by our Author's leave, this Contradiction is none of *Alting's*, but only Fathered on him by our Author's own Inference, whose Principles lead him to conclude all Unauthorized and Unlawful Baptisms to be Invalid, which is not asserted either by *Alting* or *Calvin*, as we have seen in the several Testimonies alledged from them: So that thus far, if these Men spake the Sense of the *Genevans* and *Palatines*, they are both contrary to our Author.

But, after all, the Determination of the Question about the Baptism of Unauthorized Laymen,



men, depends not upon the Sense or Practice of the Reformed Churches, but upon the Sense and Practice of the Primitive Church, to which this Author and I appeal; And when the Reader fairly considers the Evidences produced on both sides, for and against the Authority and Commission of Hereticks and Schismatics, baptizing whilst they were in their Heresy and Schism, he will be best able to judge for himself, where the Truth lies; Whether the ancient Hereticks and Schismatics, whose Baptisms were received, were true Priests, in Actual Commission, never Vacated by the Church, as this Author asserts; Or whether, as I have maintained in the foregoing Discourse, they were really and truly deprived of their Commission by the Authority and Discipline of the Church, and left in the State of Unauthorized and Uncommissioned Laymen. The deciding this Question decides the whole Dispute, and therefore this is the only Material Thing to be examined between me and this Author. I have already produced the Evidences for my Assertion, and leave him and the World to judge of the Force of them, having no farther Concern in the Present Dispute, but to clear the Truth of ancient History, and shew what was the Discipline and Practice of the Primitive Church, which I suppose, in this Question, will have its Weight with all sober and Unprejudiced Readers.

F I N I S.



---

*BOOKS Printed for R. Knaplock at the  
Bishop's-Head in St. Paul's Church-Yard.*

**A** Scholastical History of the Practice of the Church, in reference to the Administration of Baptism by Laymen. Wherein an Account is given of the Practice of the Primitive Church, the Practice of the modern *Greek* Church, and the Practice of the Churches of the Reformation. With an Appendix containing some Remarks on the Historical Part of Mr. *Lawrence's* Writings, touching the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, his Preliminary Discourse of the various Opinions of the Fathers, concerning Rebaptization and Invalid Baptisms, and his Discourse of Sacerdotal Powers. Part I.

*Origines Ecclesiasticae: Or the Antiquities of the Christian Church.* Vol. I. In two Books, whereof the first treats of Christians in general; their several Names and Degrees; of Catechumens, Laity, and Clergy: And the second gives a particular Account of the several Superior Orders and Offices in the Primitive Church. *The Second Edition.*

*Origines Ecclesiasticae: Vol. II.* Giving an Account, I. Of the Inferior Orders of the Ancient Clergy. II. Of the manner of their Elections and Ordinations, and the Particular Qualifications of such as were to be Ordain'd. III. Of their Privileges, Immunities, and Revenues. IV. Of the several Laws relating to their Employment, Life and Conversation. *The Second Edition.*

*Origines Ecclesiasticae: Vol. III.* Wherein is contained, I. An Account of the Ancient Asceticks. II. An Account of the Ancient Churches, their Original, Names, Parts, Utensils, Consecrations, Immunities, &c. III. A Geographical Description of the Districts of the Ancient Church, or, an Account of its division into Provinces, Dioceses, and Parishes, and of the first Original of these. The whole is illustrated with Cuts, Maps, and Indexes.

The *French* Churches Apology for the Church of *England*: Or, The Objections of Dissenters against the Articles, Homilies, Liturgy, and Canons of the *English* Church, consider'd and answer'd upon the Principles of the Reformed Church of *France*. A Work chiefly extracted out of the Authentick Acts and Decrees of the *French* National Synods, and the most approved Writers of that Church. These five by *J. Bingham*, Rector of *Havant*, and some time Fellow of University College, *Oxon*.











Bingham, Joseph,

A Scholastical History Of Lay-Baptism

Bd.: 2

London (1714)

Regensburg, Staatliche Bibliothek -- 999/Theol.syst.435(1/2  
urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb11118137-2